The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages, Volume 3

Horace Kinder Mann, Johannes Hollnsteiner

The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages, Volume 3

Horace Kinder Mann, Johannes Hollnsteiner

243514

STANFORD LI

To

HIS ALMA MATER

ST CUTHBERT'S COLLEGE, USHAW

THIS VOLUME

Is respectfully Dedicated

BY

A GRATEFUL SON

A LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS VOLUME

Jaffé, or Regesta . .	=	*Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed. Jaffé, 2nd ed., Lipsiæ, 1885.
Labbe	=	*Sacrosancta Concilia*, ed. Labbe and Cossart, Paris, 1671.
L. P., *Anastasius*, or the *Book of the Popes*	=	*Liber Pontificalis*, 2 vols., ed. L. Duchesne, Paris, 1886.
M. G. H., or Pertz .	=	*Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, either *Scriptores* (M. G. SS.) or *Epistolæ* (M. G. Epp.).
P. G.	=	*Patrologia Græca*, ed. Migne, Paris.
P. L.	=	*Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, Paris.
R. I. S. . . .	=	*Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. Muratori, Milan, 1723 ff.

The sign † placed before a date indicates that the date in question is the year of the death of the person after whose name the sign and the date are placed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
S. NICHOLAS I., The Great (858–867),	1
(*The False Decretals*),	135–149
HADRIAN II. (867–872),	149
(*The Papal Library*),	225–231
JOHN VIII. (872–882),	231
(*Liber Pontificalis*),	231–232
MARINUS I. (882–884),	353
HADRIAN III. (884–885),	361
STEPHEN (V.) VI. (885–891),	367
APPENDIX, Table of the Dukes of Spoleto,	403
INDEX,	405

ST. NICHOLAS I., THE GREAT.

A.D. 858–867.

Sources.—The contemporary *life* in the *Liber Pontificalis* is distinguished from those immediately preceding it by the fact that it devotes much less space to the enumeration of church restorations, and that, though the usual excuse for turning to the Pope's church offerings is brought forward, viz., the inability of the writer to record all that Nicholas accomplished in other directions, it gives much more space to his political and other actions. It is remarkable, too, by its frequent reference to the sources, viz., the pontifical archives, whence its materials were drawn. These distinguishing features were in all likelihood added by the famous cardinal librarian Anastasius; so that this is perhaps the only *life* in the *Liber Pontificalis* which may be attributed to the man to whom for a very long period the whole of it used to be assigned.[1]

Of the first importance for the biography of Nicholas are such of his numerous letters as the ravages of time have spared. Of these, inclusive of fragments, 159 have been published in the *P. L.*, t. 119, 3 in t. 129, and 2 more in the *Biblioth. Casinensis*, iv. p. 358 ff. In one of the last-named letters to the *spatharius* Michael there is an allusion to the Greek habit of tampering with documents so frequently denounced by Nicholas.[2] These

[1] *L. P.*, ii. p. v.

[2] The *spatharius* is exhorted in God's name to give the letter into the emperor's hands, and to ask him "ut ad talem interpretem

letters, for the most part rather long, but in the main lucid and replete with close argument, are of the greatest utility for the study not only of history, but also of Canon Law. To no inconsiderable extent has the latter borrowed its forms from them, as from the letters of S. Gregory I. For it was still largely resting "upon precedents rather than fixed constitutions, upon principles rather than codes."[1] It was not till the second half of the eleventh century that the great codes of Canon Law began to see the light. In connection with this influence of the letters of Nicholas upon Canon Law, it is important to bear in mind that, contrary to what is frequently stated, they were not inspired by the *False Decretals*. This has been absolutely demonstrated by Rocquain[2] and by Roy. These authors have, in the most detailed manner possible, tracked to their sources *all* the quotations of Nicholas, and have shown them to be derived for the most part from the genuine collection of canons made by Dionysius the Little, or from the authentic letters of his predecessors. In a few instances, indeed, he has cited spurious writings, as, for example, *The Acts of Pope Sylvester*. But in every case they were documents which centuries of existence had made venerable, and had caused to be generally accepted. The fact, then, that the letters of Nicholas did not owe their authority to any support from the *False Decretals* is one proof among many that the influence of this collection on the development of papal power is by no means as great as is popularly supposed.

Writers on the *diplomatics* of the papal letters have shown that

illam (epistolam) interpretandam tribuat qui non sit ausus ex ea quicquam aut minuere aut addere aut aliquid commutare."

[1] Roy, *Saint Nicholas* (Eng. ed.), p. 196.

[2] "Il convient de remarquer que tous les fragments qu'il en (the *False Decretals*) cite ont un parfait caractère d'authenticité. Il suffit, pour s'en convaincre, de rapprocher ces citations soit du *Codex Canonum*, soit des lettres authentiques qui nous ont été conservées. . . . Nous avons fait," he adds in a note, "nous-même ce rapprochement pour *toutes* les décrétales citées dans la correspondance de Nicolas. . . . Non seulment on ne peut établir . . . . que Nicolas Ier ait fait usage . . . . des pièces falsifiées de la collection pseudoisidorienne, mais on ne peut pas même affirmer qu'il ait eu cette collection entre les mains." *La Papauté au moyen âge*, p. 45 ff. *Cf.* Roy, p. 178 ff., where a detailed list of the sources used by the Pope is given (Eng. ed.).

those of Nicholas exercised no little influence on their official form; *e.g.*, the custom adhered to by that Pope, of placing his name first in the superscriptions of his letters, has been followed ever since.[1]

Then we have the works of Photius, ap. *P. G.*, tt. 101–4, particularly his letters (*ib.*, t. 102), which have been twice edited in London—in 1651, in both Greek and Latin, by Bishop Montague, and in 1864, in Greek only, by J. N. Baletta. Many of the letters of this famous patriarch are both very interesting and very elegant.

Of the various *annals*, the most important are the third part of the annals of Bertin, written by Hincmar of Rheims, and cited as his. A very curious work, already quoted, is the *Libellus de imp. potest. in Urbe Roma*, generally supposed to have been written in the middle of the tenth century, but which Lapôtre (*Jean VIII.*, c. 4), who has submitted it to a very critical examination, has, it would seem, proved to be the production of a Lombard, probably of Rieti, who wrote it in 897 or 898 in the interests of the imperial, royal, and ducal house of Spoleto. Ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, under the name of Eutropius, and in t. 139.

The manners and customs of the Slavs, who first came into contact with the Byzantine empire and the West in the sixth century, have been described by such writers of that age as Procopius,[2] Jornandes,[3] Menander,[3] etc., and in medieval times, by the Russian monk known as *Nestor*,[4] Adam[5] of Bremen, canon of Bremen in 1077, Helmold[6] of Bützaw (*Chron. Slav.*, to 1172), and his continuator, Arnold of Lubeck[6] (to 1209), and Saxo Grammaticus (*Hist. Dan.*), † after 1208. The best edition of the last work is by Holder, Strasburg, 1886.

Works.—For the series *Les Saints*, published by Lecoffre, which is being translated into English, Mons. J. Roy has

[1] Rodolico, *Note paleog. e diplomat. sul privil. pontif.*, p. 16. *Cf.* Giry, *traité de diplom.*, v.

[2] Ap. *R. I. S.*, I., pt. i. [3] Ap. *P. G.*, t. 88.

[4] Ed. with French translation by Leger, Paris, 1884; written about the end of the eleventh century.

[5] All these works have been separately edited, ap. *M. G. SS.*, in usum schol.

written an excellent biography of this Pope, *St. Nicholas I.* Paris, 1899. The English version has been published by Messrs. Duckworth, and is dated 1901. The first portion of Rocquain's *La Papauté au moyen âge*, Paris, 1881, is a reprint of three good articles of his in the *Journal des Savants* for September ff. 1880. I have made considerable use of many of the *Dissert. in Hist. Eccles.* of Jungmann, vol. iii.; *e.g.* the one on the divorce of King Lothaire. On the last-named topic, the fullest account I have met with is: *Le P. Nicholas I. et le jeune roi Lothaire*, by M. Frantin (Dijon, 1862). He seems too little inclined to believe in the innocence of Theutberga. The work of Thiel, *De Nicolao I.*, comment. duæ, Brunsbergæ, 1859, is much praised, but I have not been able to procure it.

The classical work on *Photius* is his *life* by Card. Hergenroether (3 vols., Manz, 1867), which I have only been able to consult through that author's *Church Hist.* (Fr. ed.), iii. p. 385 ff. Jager's *Hist. de Photius*, Paris, 1844, a work which will often be here quoted, is good, and as a whole, I believe, reliable. Finlay and Milman accuse him of great partiality, the former of inaccuracy also. Following him with the original authorities in hand, I cannot say I have found justification for the *general* charge of inaccuracy. If, then, his facts are substantially accurate, the reader may judge of his partiality for himself. A useful volume too, is *Storia dell' origine dello schisma Greco*, by the abbot Tosti, Rome, 1888. In the *Histoire de la civilisation Hellénique*, Paris, 1878, an abridgment, without the citation of any authorities, of his Ἱστορία τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ ἔθνους, Athens, 1865–77, 6 vols. in 8vo, Paparrigopuolo, gives an *orthodox* Greek's view of the work of Photius. From a like want, and for other reasons (see a succeeding vol. of this work under S. Leo IX.), no great help may be looked for from *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, by Rev. A. H. Hore, London, 1899. A very valuable little work is Duchesne's *Églises séparées*, Paris, 1896.

The classical edition of the Pseudo-Isidorian decrees is that of Paul Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ et Capitula Angilramni*, Lipsiæ, 1863. In an introductory commentary (pp. ccxxxvi) their nature and origin are discussed in the very ablest manner.

Emperors of the East.	Emperors of the West.
Theodora and Michael III. (the Drunkard), 842–856.	Lothaire I., 823–855.
Michael III., 856–867.	Louis II., 850–875.

Nicholas I.

IN Nicholas I., the Saint and the Great, we have not only the greatest Pontiff of his century, but one of the greatest of the very long line of grand characters who have in every age adorned the Chair of Peter. It is a saying no less true than trite that, of those few to whom men have accorded the title of Great, still fewer, if their claims be weighed in the balance of reason and not of sentiment, have been worthy of it. But to very few indeed have any large body of men ever given the combined titles of Great and Saint. Nicholas I. is one of that rare company who have been so honoured, and in his case the distinction has been conferred on very solid grounds. In the troublous and stormy times in which his days were cast, he was the pharos to which men, buffeted about by the angry waves of life, looked with eager hope. It mattered not what was the grief under which they were groaning; it was all one whether they were strong men or helpless women, whether they were in authority or in subjection, whether they were bishops[1] or simple clerics, peers or peasants, they all in their distress turned to Nicholas; they all flocked to him as to their common father. For he did not raise his voice merely in commanding tones to warn men from the ways in which they should not tread, or to point out to them the narrow road which led

[1] So great was the number of bishops that flocked to Rome in his time, that he erected a large and splendid hospice for them and their suites in connection with the Church of S. Maria in Cosmedin, which he put into repair. It is not improbable that it was for the benefit of this establishment that he again put into working order the aqueduct, viz., Aqua Jovia, which struck the Tiber near its church. *L. P.*, nn. xci. and iii.

to life eternal, but in encouragement also to help them faint, weary, or wilful, along it.

So many people crowded to Rome in his time that it became "the rendezvous of the world."[1] They came to pray[2] and to obtain pardon of their sins[3]; they came for justice[4] and they came for privileges[5] or for protection.[6] Some came, too, as ambassadors of kings or emperors, others from barbarous lands to seek the light of faith. But if all the world was thus in touch with Nicholas, he was in touch with all the world. If he was the centre of the gaze of all, his eyes were equally fixed on all. He knew what was going on in the different parts of the world from the words[7] of those who came to him from every part thereof, from his legates whom he despatched to North and South, to East and West, and from the letters he received from all quarters.

And if the gaining of victories and the framing of laws give men a title to distinction, then was Nicholas great both as a conqueror and a lawgiver. For he was really a conqueror, though not as the kings of the earth, leaving in his track blazing cities and heaps of slain. It was by

[1] "De universis mundi partibus credentium agmina principis App. liminibus properant." Ep. 133. *Cf.* Ep. 56: "Pene totus orbis undique . . . . ad sedem apost. confluens."

[2] Ep. 105.

[3] Ep. 136. "Undique . . . . plurimi suorum facinorum proditores." *Cf.* Epp. 116, 119, etc.

[4] Epp. 117, 121, 14, 34, etc. *Cf. L. P.*, n. lxiv., for the case of Seufred of Piacenza.

[5] Ep. 29.

[6] Epp. 22, 23. Kings even pray for the support of his authority. Ep. 3 of Louis and Lothaire to Nicholas, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi. 213. "Oportet præterea vestræ auctoritatis jubar propter generalem solicitudinem nostros invisere fines, ut quos nulla pacis fœdera, nulla movent fraternæ caritatis viscera . . . . apostolica invectis ad censuram ecclesiasticam venire compellat."

[7] "Fidelium relatione, qui ad SS. App. limina orationis causa veniunt, agnovimus." Ep. 105. *Cf.* Epp. 41, 56, etc.

peaceful measures that he won over the Bulgarians to the obedience of Christ, that he overcame the princes of the world, and opposed himself as an impassable barrier to their career of violent wickedness. But though moral only were the arms by which he hoped to secure real peace, they were wielded with a certain startling effectiveness. The whole civilised world was electrified by the flashing mandates he directed against its great ones. The emperor Michael, the Cæsar Bardas, the king Lothaire, the patriarch Photius, the metropolitan Hincmar, and the archbishop John of Ravenna found there was one who could and would oppose their excesses. Emperors and kings were taught that, even in this world, they had a superior who could bring to bear upon them weapons even more powerful than sword or bow. In Nicholas, on the other hand, the weak and the down-trodden found strength and support. In him Theutberga, dishonoured and disgraced, and none the less, but rather the more, dishonoured and disgraced that she was a queen and friendless, found strength not to break down under her cruel wrongs, and a sure haven of hope. To the Bulgarians he was a civil as well as an ecclesiastical legislator, and churchmen were soon taught that he was a canon-lawyer.

If he was ambitious, he was ambitious of showing himself what he believed himself to be, the first bishop, the most authoritative teacher of faith and morals, and the supreme ruler of man's spiritual destinies.[1] He was no doubt anxious for the light of the papacy to shine to the greatest number possible, and he assuredly strove to place it on a higher candlestick, that more might see it. But in

[1] *Cf.* Ep. 32. "Loci sublimitate, qua nos superna providentia totius domus suæ generalitati præposuit, provocamur ut apostolatus nostri apex . . . . fidelibus tutissimum et firmissimum refugium . . . exhibeat." *Cf.* Epp. 79, 104.

that care and effort he did nothing which his predecessors had not done. He may have expanded principles, have pushed precedent along, but it was on the old lines that he acted. He was no innovator.[1] And if he thought that in him lay the highest legislative, judicial, and executive powers in spiritual matters, he was guided in his conduct not by his own will acting arbitrarily,[2] but by written law and custom, by scripture and tradition.

Such a commanding position did he occupy, with such authority did he speak, that his contemporaries thought of him as the emperor of the world. Now it was an archbishop (Gunther) who, condemned by Nicholas for supporting, Cranmer-like, a licentious monarch, exclaimed in impotent rage: "The Lord Nicholas makes himself emperor of the whole world!"[3] Now it was a monk who, contemplating with feelings of triumphant righteousness the way in which he opposed wickedness in high places, acclaimed him for presiding "authoritatively over kings and tyrants as though he were the lord of the earth."[4]

The early years of Nicholas.

Like Leo I. and Gregory I., the other two pontiffs who share with him the titles of Saint and Great, Nicholas was a Roman. His father, Theodore, is described as a *regionary*, probably a regionary notary and the same man as the Theodore who with the titles of *notarius* and *scriniarius* figures in the Roman Council of 853. From his very boyhood the future Pope is said to have been of a serious and studious turn of mind; and his father, himself a great lover of learning, had him carefully instructed in sacred and profane literature. The youth made most gratifying progress, and grew in

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 128.

[2] "Neque enim hic divinorum executor operum piisimus papa que sua sunt, sed ea quæ Dei sunt primo loco posuit et quæsivit." *L. P.*, n. lxxvii.

[3] Hincmar., *Annal.*, an. 864.

[4] *Chron.*, an. 868, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.

learning as he grew in stature. Those who had "the discernment[1] of spirits," loudly declared that the boy would mount high the ladder of fame. The great reputation which he soon gained induced Pope Sergius II. to bring him from his father's house into the Lateran palace, and make him a sub-deacon.[2] By Leo IV., to whom he was most dear, he was made a deacon, in which capacity "he was loved by the clergy and people, and honoured by the nobility." To Benedict III., "a most amiable man and most holy Pontiff," who was never happy without his company, he was an object of greater affection than his own relations, and was employed by him to assist him in important ecclesiastical affairs, in which the excellent judgment of the young cleric showed itself conspicuously. With other deacons, Nicholas carried his predecessor's body to St. Peter's, and with his own hands placed it in the tomb. And during his after career he kept his example ever before his eyes, and "in every good work made himself his most zealous heir."[3]

Election of Nicholas, 858.

After such an illustriously well spent youth, and after the important part he had played under Benedict III., it certainly causes us no surprise when we find it recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis* that he was elected to succeed him after the cardinal of S. Mark's had again refused to be Pope.[4] On the death of the last-mentioned pontiff, the emperor Louis II., who had been in Rome just before that event and had left it, at once returned thither,[5] while the clergy[6] and nobility adjourned to the *basilica of S. Dionysius*,

[1] *L. P.*

[2] *Ib.* "Et in subdiaconatus per benedictionis gratiam constituit gradu."

[3] *L. P., in vit. Bened.*, "Cujus vestigia sequens successor ejus . . . cum tamquam heres devotissimus imitatus est."

[4] *L. P., in vit. Had. II.*, n. iii. [5] *L. P., in vit. Nic.*

[6] "Clerus, proceres, et optimatum genus." *Ib.*

i.e. to the church now known as S. Silvester *in Capite*,[1] to earnestly beg of God a worthy successor. "By divine inspiration," after a consultation of some hours, they unanimously (*unanimes*) elected Nicholas. But he, saying he was unworthy of such an honour, fled to St. Peter's. Thence, however, he was taken perforce to the Lateran palace and "placed on the apostolic throne."

This account, as well of the early career as of the election of Nicholas, furnished us by his biographer, is decidedly calculated to make us slow to accept the assertion of Prudentius[2] that the choice of him as Pope was due more "to the presence and support of Louis and his nobles than to the election of the clergy." Doubtless he was a *persona grata* both to the emperor and to his nobility; but his virtue, his conspicuous ability, and the position of importance and trust he had held under Benedict, fully justify the assertion of the *Liber Pontificalis* that his election was the unanimous work of clergy and people. Louis's influence simply swelled the tide of popular favour which was flowing steadily towards Nicholas.

But whether Nicholas owed his exalted position to Louis or not, it is certain that he was very much opposed to the interference in papal elections of any individuals not authorised by the canons. Accordingly, in the council of 862, he renewed the decree of the Lateran Council of 769, which forbade any persons not of the recognised Roman electoral body to concern themselves in the election of a Pope.[3] The reference, however, to the decree of Pope Stephen, which was directed against the doings of the antipope Constantine, would seem to show that this

[1] *L. P.*, ii. p. 149, n. 21. [2] *Annal.*, ad an. 858.

[3] "Si quis Sacerdotibus seu Primatibus, Nobilibus seu cuncto clero hujus S. R. E. electionem R. Pontificis contradicere præsumerit, sicut in concilio bb. Stephani (III.) IV. P. statutum est, anathema sit." C. 11, ap. *R. I. S.*, ii., pt. ii., p. 128.

canon was aimed not so much against the emperor as against the party of the antipope Anastasius.

On Sunday, April 24, in the presence of the emperor, Nicholas was consecrated in St. Peter's, and then, after offering up the Holy Sacrifice "over the most sacred body of the apostle,"[1] he was, as usual, escorted back with hymns and canticles to the Lateran amidst the densest throngs of both nobles and commoners, through a city bedecked with garlands, and amid the greatest rejoicings of clergy, senate, and people.[2]

The coronation (?) of Nicholas.

Through a false punctuation,[3] the old editions of the

[1] Another indication that contemporaries had no thought that the relics of St. Peter had been destroyed by the Saracens.

[2] "Coronatur denique urbs, exultat clerus, lætatur senatus, et populi plenitudo magnifice gratulabatur." *L. P.*, n. vii.

[3] "Coronatur denique, urbs exultat, clerus lætatur, senatus et populi, etc. That the new punctuation is the correct one is plain as well from a comparison with the corresponding sentence in the *life* of Benedict III. (n. v.), "Lætatur præterea urbs, exultat ecclesia," etc., as from a passage (c. 3) in the *Ordo Romanus*, ix., ap. Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii., or *P. L.*, t. 78, p. 1005. Speaking of the procession of the Pope and of newly ordained priests, etc., to be made after the ordination service is over, the *Ordo* continues: "Plateæ autem civitatis, unde transituri sunt, coronantur lauro et palliis, et cum tanta gloria ad statutos titulos deducunt proprios sacerdotes," etc. *Cf.* c. 6. This *Ordo* is said to exist in a MS. of the ninth century, and hence cannot be of later date than that age. Its antiquity is confirmed by the mention in it of the *blessing* of "deaconesses and priestesses." Dating from the earliest days of the Church, these orders ceased at different times in different countries. But it is hard to say when exactly they ceased to exist in the different countries of the West. It is certain their abolition was decreed by the councils of Albon (diocese of Vienne) in 517, and of Orleans (can. 18) in 533. But while Alzog, *Ch. Hist.*, i. 456, makes them expire in the seventh century, Wouters, *Dissert. in H. E.*, i. 10, gives them till the eighth century. The authors of *Cath. Dict.*, *sub voce* 'deaconess,' says they were extinct in the tenth century, and Card. Bona (*Rer. Liturg.*, L. i. c. 25) thinks they had certainly vanished in the eleventh century. It is certainly not easy to find any mention of them even in the ninth century. Besides, the *Ordo* was seemingly composed under a Pope Leo. The *patroni* of the various regions had to acclaim "Domnus Leo P. quem S. Petrus elegit in sua sede multis

Liber Pontificalis were made to state that Nicholas was *crowned* when he reached the Lateran. In later ages the popes were crowned in St. Peter's, and if Nicholas was crowned at all, it was no doubt in the same place. Though it is not so stated in the *Book of the Popes*, there seems, however, good reason to believe that a papal coronation ceremony was introduced in the course of this century. The forged document known as the *Donation of Constantine* pretended that Constantine gave to Pope Sylvester "the diadem, *i.e.* the crown of our head and a tiara (*frigium—candido nitore*, as another passage has it)"; but that, as the Pope would not wear a golden crown on the clerical crown of his tonsure (*super coronam glericatus, sic*), "we have with our own hands placed upon his most sacred head a mitre of exceeding whiteness typical of the glorious resurrection of Our Lord."[1] Now whether the *Donatio* first saw the light in the Vatican in 774, as many authors hold, or in France along with the *False Decretals*,[2] it was certainly in existence before the days of Nicholas, and affords proof positive that the wearing of a regal crown by the Pope had been mooted.

If the ceremony of crowning the popes was discussed in the first half of the ninth century at latest, it would seem that it was practised before the close of its second half. We have seen that Mabillon's *Ordo Romanus IX.*,[3] which includes the rite of consecrating the bishop of Rome, was in all likelihood a production of this same century, and

annis sedere" (c. 6). The Pope Leo could not well be Leo V. or the other Leos of the tenth century. Roman *Ordos* were not composed in that age so terrible for papal Rome. The *Domnus Leo* will then, no doubt, be Leo III. or Leo IV. *Cf.* also Bingham, *Antiquities*, L. ii. c. 22.

[1] The quotations are taken from Deusdedit's ed. of the *Donatio*, ed. Martin., pp. 344–5.

[2] See the copy of it in their midst, p. 249, ed. Hinschius.

[3] Ap. *P. L.*, t. 78, or Watterich, *Pont. Rom. Vit.*, vol. i. p. 3.

contains a notice of the imposition of a crown upon the head of the Pope. Its venerable antiquity is our excuse for giving it in full.

The Pope-elect, who must, it says, be a cardinal priest or deacon,[1] is to be escorted to the basilica of St. Peter by all the clergy and people. After the pontifical vestments have been put upon him in the sacristy, he is to go to the *confession* of St. Peter, and there prostrate himself in prayer, while the *schola cantorum* sings the Introit, *Elegit te Dominus*. He must then rise, go up to the altar and again prostrate himself in prayer, and all the clergy with him. Raised by the bishops, he is to be placed between the faldstool or throne (*sedes*) and the altar. The Book of the Gospels is to be held over his head, and after the first and second of the consecrating bishops have each said a prayer over him, the third is to consecrate him. Then the archdeacon must invest him with the pallium, and, assisted by the deacon, place him on the throne. From the steps thereof he must intone the *Gloria in excelsis* and wish *Peace* to all. Thereupon the schola and the heads (*patroni*) of the different regions are to acclaim him with the *laudes*. Then the Pontiff is to proceed with the Mass, at which all are to communicate. After Mass, as he returns in full procession to the sacristy, his blessing is to be asked by all the scholæ of the foreigners, by the English, by the Franks, etc., who are to respond to its reception by a resounding *Amen!*[2]

Returned to the sacristy, the Pope must then take his seat in the *sella gestatoria* (*sella apostolica*). When he reaches the lower steps of St. Peter's, he will there find ready for him his predecessor's horse or sedan chair. After the *patroni* of the regions have thrice chanted the words:

[1] "Nam episcopus esse non poterit." *Ib.*, c. 5. This phrase was, I should say, certainly composed before Bishop Formosus became Pope.

[2] "Respondent ei omnes cum strepitu *Amen*." *Ib.*

"The Lord Pope *Leo*, whom St. Peter has chosen to sit in his chair for many years," the Master of the Horse (*prior stabuli*) is to approach and place on the Pope's head "a crown (*regnum*) made of some white material and like a helmet."[1] The word *regnum* would seem to imply something more than the *frigium* of the *Donatio*. It was no doubt a real crown, a tiara with golden circlet at its base.

With the *regnum* upon his head, mounted upon his horse, and surrounded by the *judges*, he is to ride through the crowded streets, while the people sing the customary *laudes*.

A coronation ceremony of some sort, then, was apparently in vogue during the ninth century, and there is evidence that it affected Nicholas. But again, unfortunately, there is a weak link in the chain of evidence. In the narthex of the subterranean Church of St. Clement,[2] discovered by Father Mullooly in 1857, there is a fresco executed at the expense of a certain Maria Macellaria, in return for favours received. The painting represents the translation of a body, evidently that of a saint and bishop, for it is depicted with a pallium and a round nimbus. The body is followed by a Pope between two ecclesiastics, dressed alike, but in a

[1] "Regnum, quod ad similitudinem cassidis ex albo fit indumento." *Ib. Cf.* the Abbot Suger (†1152) in his *life* of Louis, the Fat. "Capiti ejus (Innocent II.) *frigium, ornamentum imperiale*, instar galee circulo aureo circinatum imponunt." C. 31. As early, at least, as the days of Pope Constantine (708–15) the popes were in the habit of wearing an ordinary tiara, the *frigium* of the *Donatio*. For he appeared in the streets of Constantinople "cum camelauco, ut solitus est Roma (another reading has Rome) procedere." *L. P., in vit. Const.*, n. v. This *camelaucum*, Duchesne (*ib.*, i. 394, n. 18) calls the καμελαύκιον at present worn by the Greek clergy, and the prototype of the tiara of the Middle Ages; but as worn by Constantine it was, seemingly, an imperial ornament. For Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in his *De administratione Imper.*, c. 13, notes that one of the three requests never to be granted to barbarian chieftains was the one for imperial robes and *crowns* of the kind called καμελαύκια.

[2] This church was built probably in the fourth century. In it S. Gregory preached his thirty-third homily.

costume which is not that of Rome. Of these persons one has a round nimbus and the other holds a large cross. The Pope, whom the inscription below the fresco enables us to identify as Nicholas I.,[1] also has the round nimbus, and wears a tiara with a crown attached. The same Pope is represented on the right of the picture as saying Mass in a little chapel.

The question now arises, Who is the saint whose body is being translated, and when was the fresco painted? As the church was ruined by Robert Guiscard in 1084, the painting must have been executed before that date,[2] and it would appear probable that it was really painted before the death of S. Methodius (†885), the brother of the other great Slav apostle, St. Cyril. For it seems to us that the translation is that of St. Clement, whose body the two brothers brought to Rome, that the ecclesiastic with the round nimbus on the right of Pope Nicholas is St. Cyril, whose head was so decorated because he was dead when the picture was painted, and that the other similarly dressed ecclesiastic on the left of the Pope is his brother S. Methodius, still alive when the fresco was executed. Pope Nicholas, however, was dead when the holy brothers reached Rome, and the translation of the relics took place under his successor, Hadrian II. But it was he who ordered them to come to Rome, and hence on that account might well be honoured with the important place in the fresco and in its inscription. Moreover, by depicting him with the round nimbus, the artist has sufficiently indicated that he was actually dead at the time of the translation. If, then, the reader is prepared to accept the conclusion that this fresco was painted before the death

[1] "Hoc a Vaticano fertur PP. Nicolao. imnis divinis qd aromatib. sepelivit"; *i.e.* "Hither from the Vatican is borne, Nicholas being Pope, with divine hymns (the body) which he buried with aromatics."

[2] Hence Duchesne and others are obviously mistaken in assigning this fresco to the twelfth century.

of S. Methodius, then we have contemporary evidence that Nicholas I. wore a crown[1] adorned with gems.

In the sacristy of St. Peter's there exists yet another relic of the past which seems to prove that in the ninth century the popes wore a crown. It is a picture described in an inventory[2] of 1455 as 'of Constantine,' and showing, in its upper portion, the half figures of SS. Peter and Paul, and a similar figure of Our Lord between them giving His benediction. Over the two apostles are their names in Slavonic characters. In the centre of the lower half is a male figure clad in a chasuble, wearing the pallium on his shoulders and "a tiara or papal mitre with one crown," and in the act of blessing a man, also clad in a chasuble, who is kneeling at his feet. Two other figures, represented as Greek monks, stand one at each side. There is little doubt that the figure wearing the crown is that of Pope Hadrian II., that he is blessing S. Methodius, that the 'monks' are the two brothers Cyril and Methodius, and that the picture is contemporary with the latter. It would seem likely that it was offered to the confession of St. Peter, where it used to be placed, by S. Methodius in memory of his brother Cyril, or *Constantine*.[3] If, however,

[1] *Cf. S. Clement*, by Mullooly, p. 299 f.; Marucchi, *Les Basiliques*, p. 291 ff.; Novæs, Dissert. V., *Della sol. coron. de' Pontef.*, in vol. ii. of his *Introdux. alle vite R. P.*, Rome, 1822; Müntz (see next note 1), etc. In the new ed. (1903) of their *Hist. of Painting in Italy*, i. 45. Crowe and Cavalcaselle assign the frescos of the subterranean basilica *probably* to the ninth, or perhaps to the tenth, century.

[2] Ap. Cirillo e Metodio, p. 249. The picture is 3½ palms high by 2 palms 2 inches wide. The Roman palm measures between 8 and 9 inches.

[3] Hence its description 'of Constantine,' and hence the confusion of Grimaldi, who, describing this 'tabula antiquissima' in 1617, connects it with Constantine the Great. On all this see Bartolini's appendix to his *Cirillo*. With a number of Dalmatian canons, artists, etc., he examined this most interesting picture in 1881. D'Avril, *St. Cyrille*, p. 173 n., holds that it does not belong to an earlier period than the thirteenth century.

with all this the reader is not prepared to be bound by a chain not at all strong, he must at any rate admit that the popes were crowned at least in the eleventh century.[1]

Character of Nicholas.

The Pontiff, the order of whose consecration and coronation we have been able to view through the old *ordo* brought to light by Mabillon, is said by his biographer to have been patient and temperate, humble and pure, handsome of face and graceful of form, both learned and modest in his utterances, illustrious by his great deeds, devoted to fasting and to the Divine Services, the support of the widow and the orphan, and the defender of all the people." That he was a real lover of the poor he proved by his conduct. Like his great predecessor S. Gregory I., he kept by him a list of the blind and the disabled throughout the city, and to these he had food sent daily. But to such of the poor as were strong enough to come for food, he distributed provisions in turn on the different days of the week. And that they might know on what day they had to present themselves for the Pope's alms, they received tokens marked with his name and having attached to them a number of knots formed by nuts. The number of nuts on his token showed the poor man on what day he had to come.

Another distinguishing trait in the character of Nicholas,

[1] It is actually stated of S. Gregory VII. that he was crowned. *L. P.*, *in vit.*, ii. p. 282. There can be little doubt that the second crown was added to the tiara by Boniface VIII. towards the close of his life. *Cf.* Müntz, *La tiare pontificale*, pp. 14, 41. The third was added at the beginning of the fourteenth century, and, if not worn by Clement V., was certainly worn by Benedict XII. *Ib.*, pp. 45-7. As opposed to the mitre, the emblem of spiritual power, the tiara, according to Innocent III., is the symbol of temporal power (Müntz, p. 23). In the three crowns of the tiara itself some see the royalty of the episcopate, the pontifical supremacy, and the temporal sovereignty; others the church, suffering, militant and triumphant, etc., etc.

recorded by his biographer, was his unceasing energy in working for good. If any scandal arose in the Church "he gave neither rest to his body nor sleep to its members" till by his envoys, letters, or prayers, a reformation was effected.[1] He was assuredly one of those who worked as if good had to be wrought by himself alone, but who prayed[2] as if it had to be done by God alone.

The fame of his learning and of his clear-headed justice[3] caused more cases to be brought for his decision from all parts of the world than were ever brought before "within the memory of anyone."[4] And those who were so fortunate as to be thus able to lay their cases before him, returned home "blessed and instructed." And yet it must be borne in mind that as far back as the fourth century, a secretary (St. Jerome) of a Pope (St. Damasus) had already declared (Ep. 130) that he had "to reply to many consultations which were addressed to the Apostolic See from the East and from the West." All this work for the spiritual and temporal good, not only of Rome but of the world at large, meant a terrible strain upon the physical powers of the master labourer in the vineyard.[5] And if this pressure of work was not the original cause of the breakdown of his health, it had at least to be borne by a frame often racked with disease. "With such pain," he wrote, "has our Heavenly Father seen fit to afflict me, that not only am I unable to write suitable replies to

[1] *Cf. L. P.*, n. lvi. f., for an account of his exertions to put down incestuous marriages which were much in vogue amongst the Sardinians.

[2] "Dei tantum respectu corrigere illud malens etc." *L. P.*

[3] *Cf.* his letter to Archbishop Wenilo of Sens, on the charges brought by him against Herimann, bishop of Nevers (Migne, Ep. 1).

[4] "Tot, tantæque diversarum provinciarum . . . . ad sedem apost. consultationes directæ sunt, quantas numquam penitus quis reminiscitur a priscis temporibus pervenisse." *L. P.*

[5] *Cf.* Ep. 17.

your question, but I cannot, through the intensity of my sufferings, even dictate an answer to them."[1] Like Gregory, the Great, he found strength to work for God and man where ordinary men could scarce find strength to live for themselves.

But if Nicholas was a father to the poor, and meek and mild to those who kept the law of God, he always spoke as one having authority, and was "terrible and full of harshness to those who wandered away from the right path," and "he ruled kings and tyrants, and, as though he were the lord of the earth, presided authoritatively over them." Such is the language of the monk Regino,[2] who rightly regarded him as the greatest pope after S. Gregory I. It is to be hoped that the course of this narrative will make it plain that even the eminently flattering character ascribed to Nicholas, in the almost stereotyped language of the *Liber Pontificalis*, was not overdrawn, and that, in the words of an old fourteenth century English monk, "scarce any occupant of the papal chair was to be compared with him."[3]

Two days after his consecration the Pope and the emperor met at a solemn banquet, at which the brilliant conversational powers of the former were conspicuous,[4] and parted after a cordial embrace. The Pope and Louis after the 'consecration.'

It was probably at a Mass celebrated by the Pope on one or other of these days, at which the emperor was present, that were chanted just before the Epistle the solemn *laudes*, in honour of Nicholas and Louis, which have been printed by Grisar.[5] In the midst of invocations to Our Lord Jesus Christ, "the Saviour of the world," for His mercy and help, "life" is wished "to our

[1] Ep. 86, p. 947.
[2] *Eulogium hist.*, l. ii. c. 16.
[3] In *Chron.*, ad an. 868.
[4] "Sophistico famine resplendebat, claritateque plenus epulabatur in Christo." *L. P.*, n. vii.
[5] *Analecta Rom.*, i. 229.

lord Nicholas, by God's decree supreme pontiff and universal Pope," and "life and victory to our lord Louis Augustus, crowned by God, the great and pacific emperor." Then whilst the help of Our Lady, SS. Peter and Paul, and SS. Andrew and John is being besought, "life" is wished "to the emperor's most excellent royal sons," and "life and victory to the *army* of the Romans and Franks." The *laudes* terminated with, "Christ conquers. He is our king and emperor."

When Louis left the city, he rested at St. Leucius, close to where the remains of the Tor di Quinto[1] now stand—so called from its being about *five* miles from the Porta Ratumena of the Servian walls. Thither, with the notables of Church and State, Nicholas went out to salute him. When Louis saw him coming, he advanced to meet him, and led his horse about 'an arrow's flight.' After talking and feasting together, the Pope set out for Rome loaded with presents. Louis, who accompanied him for some distance, again did himself the honour[2] of leading the Pope's horse. In these acts of mutual courtesy we see summed up the amicable relations which, for the most part, distinguish the intercourse between Louis and Nicholas, and the commanding position to be taken up by the latter in the face of the world.

The Greek schism.

Now that we have seen Nicholas fairly launched on his pontificate, we cannot do better than begin our account of its history by treating of Photius and the Greek schism, not only because Nicholas had not been Pope very long before he came into contact with the Greeks, but because the story of Photius is of the first importance,

[1] "Sedem in loco, qui Quintus dicitur, collocavit." *L. P.*

[2] Gregorovius calls this act of Louis that of "an emperor who so far forgot his dignity" (iii. 121). But Louis believed that Nicholas was the Vicar of Christ, and chose to give a proof that his conduct and belief were in accord.

not merely in the *life* of Nicholas, but in the history of mankind.

To bring about the schism of the Greeks, which was virtually[1] consummated by Photius, and which resulted in such political, intellectual, and spiritual loss both to the East and to the West, there had long been many causes at work. Its causes.

For if it is obvious that it has brought great loss to the Greeks, it cannot be denied that the Latins have also suffered through it. While, for instance, the arms of both peoples ought to have been directed against the Moslem, the most aggressive foe of Christianity, they were, after frequently crossing more or less in the dark, finally destined to be openly and bitterly turned against each other. From the want of hearty co-operation, not to say through the presence of secret hostility, on the part of the Greeks, the heroic struggle of the Latins to recover the Holy Land from the infidel, failed; while, on the other hand, the power of the Greeks themselves was broken for ever by their expulsion from Constantinople (1204) by the Latins. And by thus breaking down a lock-gate which retarded the wave of the Mohammedan, they were in turn to be fearfully afflicted by its unchecked flood.

If, moreover, the schism had the effect of cutting off the Greeks from beneficial contact with the intellectual life, vigorous if youthful, which sprang up among the Western nations in the Middle Ages, the latter, in consequence of it, received a diminished infusion of the superior intellectual and material refinement possessed by the former and a smaller share of their inherited wisdom.

And finally, while, by their separation from the Latins, the East failed to be influenced by the vivifying faith of the

[1] Actually in the middle of the eleventh century (1054), under the patriarch Michael Cærularius.

West, which in the Middle Ages was as bright and as energetic as its intellectual endeavour, the West lost the benefit it would have derived from close union with the deep religious feelings of the East. By its divided front, too, all Christendom has been weakened in the face of both heresy and unbelief.

Of the causes which brought about this disastrous and deplorable schism, some were natural and others artificial; and of these again some were of a more or less accidental growth, and others directly predisposing to schism. Under natural causes may be grouped the great diversity of character between the practical Romans and the theoretical Greeks, and the dissimilarity of their languages. Difficulties from this latter difference became quite pronounced even in the sixth century, and the lessened intercourse between the East and West, brought about by this linguistic difficulty and by the barbarian invasions of the fifth and sixth centuries, was increased by the antipathy with which the Romans regarded a 'Roman empire' which became less and less Roman every day, and by that with which the Greeks in turn looked on the growth of the 'temporal power' of the popes and the renovation of the Western empire. And if the Eastern bishops looked down upon the Western for their want of culture, they were themselves despised by the latter for their base subservience to the emperors.[1] Furthermore, the Italians could not forget how they had been oppressed by the Greek exarchs, and how even the popes had been maltreated, and their patrimonies in Sicily, etc., confiscated by the emperors of Constanti-

[1] "Sunt Græci episcopi habentes divitis (*sic*) et opolentas eclesias et non paciuntur duo mensis a rerum eclesiasticarum dominacione suspendi; pro qua re . . . . secundum volumptatem principum, quidquid ab eis quæsitum fuerit, sine altercatione consenciunt." Ep. of Italian clerics concerning the treatment of Pope Vigilius, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. p. 439.

nople. Nor could the popes themselves be unmindful of the many[1] heretical patriarchs who had disgraced the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, and of their unjust usurpation of papal rights over the province of Illyricum during the Iconoclast controversy.

Accidental causes were such political events as the separation of the empire into two parts, which sooner or later practically corresponded with the two divisions of its subject races into those which spoke Latin and those which spoke Greek. Then there followed the extinction of the Western-Roman empire and its occupation by barbarian peoples, objects at once of hatred and contempt to the more cultured inhabitants of the Eastern-Roman empire. Accidental causes also were differences of religious rites and discipline, especially in the matter of the celibacy of the clergy, and the different state of theological science in the East and West. To the once great activity in that respect among the Greeks had succeeded a languor scarcely disturbed by the iconoclast difficulty, whereas, among the Latins, the conversion of the nations and the controversies on Adoptionism, on Grace and Predestination, had given a considerable impetus to the study of theology. This development of doctrinal studies in the West was viewed with suspicion by the Greeks, and they turned their genius for controversy against the Latins.

To pass over the effect of previous schisms[2] in preparing

[1] Of the fifty-eight bishops of Constantinople from St. Metrophanes (315–325) to S. Ignatius, twenty-one were either heretics or upholders of heresy; and as evidence of their dependence on the State, it may be noted that over twenty of them were deposed by different emperors. *Cf.* Jungmann, diss. xvii. § 3.

[2] From the time when Constantine succeeded to the empire of the East (323) to the accession of Nicholas I., a period of over five hundred years had elapsed, and during that period there had been five great schisms between Rome and Constantinople, lasting over two hundred years.

the way for the schism of the ninth century, its most potent cause was that which modern authors call *Byzantinism*, which they compare with *Gallicanism* and *Josephism*, and which may be defined as a suspicion of, and hostility towards, the supreme spiritual authority of the Holy See engendered by a false idea of national independence, and carefully cultivated by ambitious men for their own advancement. Its chief propagators in the Greek Church were the body of bishops whom the emperor kept at his beck and call, and who formed the assembly which, in time known as the *Permanent Synod* (σύνοδος ἐνδήμουσα), has survived to this day, and which soon came to regard itself as the imperial agent in matters spiritual.

When the clergy of a country, hoping to be freer by getting rid of the jurisdiction of the Holy See, have embraced these views of national independence, they have only earned for themselves a base dependence on the civil power. They have found the local civil authority a very different controlling power to that of a spiritual power at a distance. And if, for instance, the clergy of the established Church of England and of that of Russia are to-day dependent on the State even in matters most sacred and most spiritual, the clergy of Constantinople were in the same condition long before the century of which we are now treating. For many of the causes already enumerated had been at work for centuries. The schism of the Greeks really began with the rise of Constantine's new city by the Golden Horn. The transference of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople had for one of its results the popes' gaining temporal power in the West and losing spiritual authority in the East. What their primacy gained, during the interval between the foundation of Constantinople and the final schism of the Greeks under Michael Cerularius, in intensity

and directness, it lost in geographical extent. If Photius and Cerularius were able to sever the last bonds which connected the East and the West, it was because the process of sundering had been begun under Constantine by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and his supporters in the war he waged through court influence on the Council of Nice, on St. Athanasius, and on the popes who upheld him.

The Eusebians had cleared the approaches which led to the stout wall of Unity which had surrounded the East and West up till the days of Constantine. The bishops of Byzantium, now become patriarchs of Constantinople, were to make breaches in it and finally to throw it to the ground. Anxious to be the first ecclesiastics in the empire, they did not scruple, in order to purchase the support of the might of the emperors, to prostitute their spiritual prerogatives to the will of their temporal lords. The clergy of Constantinople, partly through jealousy of the power of the Bishop of Rome and partly to curry favour with their own patriarch, were ever prepared to lend their support to his ambitious aims. And finally the emperor, that he might rule the minds, wills, and consciences, as well as the bodies of his subjects, was also ever ready to push forward the spiritual pretensions of a man of whose subservience he was sure.

A short sketch of the means by which the once simple bishops of Byzantium,[1] dependent on the metropolitan of Heraclea in Thrace, became patriarchs of Constantinople, with precedence over the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, and then rivals of the popes of Rome, will

[1] J. M. Neale (*A Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, p. 26) notes that Byzantium before its refoundation by Constantine "does not appear to have possessed any bishop of its own"; that the names of only three prelates, 'suffragans of Heraclea,' who governed it before that epoch are known, and that "under the exarchs of that city the bishops of Constantinople were content to remain for several years."

shed, it is to be hoped, no little light on the attitude and action of Photius.

Ecclesiastical authority in the early Church.

Before Constantine took in hand the old Greek half-destroyed commercial city of Byzantium, and transformed it into the glorious capital to which he gave his name, there was no ecclesiastical authority of the slightest consequence at all by the Golden Horn. But it was a different thing with some of the cities of the Roman empire, which were already famous before the advent of the first Christian emperor. Antioch by the Orontes, and Alexandria on the Nile's delta, were renowned throughout the civilised world. Its illustrious history had given an undying fame to Carthage. The residence of St. John, the beloved apostle, at Ephesus, and of St. Polycarp, his disciple at Smyrna, had endeared those cities to the followers of Christ. Its hoary age, the fact that it was the capital of Cappadocia, and the fame of one of its early bishops (St. Firmilian), all contributed to make Cæsarea one of the most distinguished of the churches of proconsular Asia. In all these places there was from the earliest times of the Christian faith more or less of episcopal jurisdiction. But while one of these churches, or even for a time Milan in the West, is seen in the foreground of Christian life at one time, and another at another, there is one Church, that of the Eternal City by the Tiber, which is regularly in the forefront, which seems to tower above the others, and to which the others bow down as did the sheaves of his brethren to that of Joseph.[1]

That of Rome.

Of the different churches to which the great Apostle of the Gentiles sent his epistles, one is signalled out for especial praise. It is that of the Romans. It was their faith, he said, which was already "spoken of in the whole world,"[2] and it was to be comforted in that[3] which made

[1] Gen. ch. xxxvii. [2] Ros. i. 8. [3] *Ib.*, 12.

him "long to see them." Strong in that faith, we see the Church of Rome through its bishop "confirming the brethren,"[1] even before the last of the apostles has gone to give an account of his glorious stewardship. There were dissensions in the Church of Corinth. Rome is at once troubled, and her bishop, Clement, who is by many thought to have been the friend of St. Paul,[2] whose name is linked with that of the apostles by numerous documents, apocryphal and otherwise, of the early Church, and who was certainly one of the immediate successors of St. Peter as bishop of Rome, at once intervenes. About the year 97, he addressed a long letter to the Corinthians, exhorting them to concord and to submission to their ecclesiastical superiors. "For ye will afford joy and gladness to us if, being *obedient unto the things written by us through the Holy Ghost*," ye cut off the unrighteous passion of your jealousy, according to the exhortation which we have made for peace and oneness of mind in this our letter. And we have also sent men, faithful and prudent . . . . who shall also be witnesses between you and us. And this have we done, that ye may know that there hath been and is in us every longing that ye may quickly be at peace."[3]

Already had the bishop of Rome been recognised as the intermediary of communication between the churches. The author of that curiously mystical work, *The Shepherd*

[1] St. Luke xxii. 32. [2] Philip. iv. 3.

[3] Ep. I, ad Cor., n. 63. This passage will not be found in any ed. printed before 1875; for it was in that year that Bryennios, metropolitan of Serræ, discovered for the first time a complete copy of this important letter at Constantinople. "Χαρὰν γὰρ . . . . ἡμῖν παρέξετε, ἐὰν ἦτε ὑπήκοοι τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν γεγραμμένοις διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος," etc. We quote from Vizzini's ed. of 1901. It is found in the first vol. of the new series, *Bibliotheca SS. Patrum*, edited by him in Rome. In the text we have used the translation in the series, *Ancient and Modern Library of Theol. Literature*, London, Griffith & Co.; *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part I.

of Hermas, tells us that the *Church of God*, who appeared to him as an old woman, asked him if he had yet delivered her book to the elders (πρεσβυτέροις) of the Church, and then instructed him to send it to Clement. "For Clement shall send it to the foreign cities, because it is entrusted to him to do so."[1] The result of Clement's despatch of the work of *Hermas* was that in some places it was placed on a level with the canonical books of the Sacred Scriptures, and his own letter was received with such respect by the Corinthians, that it became "the practice to read it in the churches."[2]

Another disciple of St. Peter, and not only of St. Peter but also seemingly[3] of St. Paul, and certainly of St. John, viz., the illustrious martyr St. Ignatius, bears testimony to the exceptional position of the Church of Rome. Though letters of his to such famous early churches as those of Smyrna and Ephesus are extant, there is nothing in them to compare with the language he addresses to that of Rome. Writing to it, there is question at once of presidency. Not merely is it the Church "which presides in the place of the region of the Romans,"[4] which might only mean "in Rome" and not "in the whole Roman empire"; but, less ambiguously, it is the Church "which presides over the universal assembly of love,"[5] *i.e.* over "the whole Christian *agape*" or "the whole Church."

[1] "πέμψει οὖν Κλήμης εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται." L. i., vis. ii. 4.

[2] So says Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, ap. Eusebius, iv. 23.

[3] *Cf.* Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, February, in his *life* of St. Ignatius.

[4] Ep. ad Ros., "ἥτις καὶ προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων."

[5] *Ib.*, καὶ προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης. It has been pointed out that wherever προκαθῆσθαι is used, it is employed with reference to some *place* or *gathering of people* (*societas*). Hence in this passage, if the Roman Church is said "to preside over charity," it is another way of saying over "the congregation of charity." *Cf.* the notes to Vizzini's ed., p. 132 ff. I do not with Duchesne quote from the text of the letter (n. 3)

What was said of the Roman Church by St. Paul and the immediate disciples of the apostles, in words which were striking indeed, but which, from the circumstances under which they wrote, were not very definite or explicit, was said, owing to circumstances which called for more cogent language, in a more minute and detailed way by those who had been trained by the disciples of the apostles. St. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, whose parents had placed him under St. Polycarp,[1] had occasion to refute certain heretics. To confound them he appeals to the tradition of the churches, and at first, not unnaturally, he appeals to that of his master, *i.e.* to that of Smyrna. But then he continues: "But as it would take too long to go through all the churches, it will be enough for me to point out the apostolic tradition, the teaching which has come down to us by the episcopal succession in the Church of Rome, the greatest and most ancient of all (*maximæ et antiquissimæ*), and known to all, founded at Rome by the two glorious apostles, Peter and Paul. This tradition is enough to confound all who, in one way or another, by self-conceit, love of applause, blindness, or false persuasions, are outside the truth. For with this church, by reason of its more powerful principality (or chiefer presidentship, *principalitas*), every church must agree—*i.e.* the faithful everywhere—in which (the Roman Church) the tradition of the apostles has ever been preserved by those on every side."[2]

Now that we have seen something of the manner in which, during apostolic and subapostolic times, the Church of Rome stands out among the other churches, we

the words, "οὐδένατε ἐβασκάνατε οὐδενὶ ἀλλους ἐδιδάξατε," because, though the syntax seems to favour his interpretation of them, "you have never *deceived* any one but have taught others," the context seems to require, "you have never *envied* anyone (viz., the glory of martyrdom)" etc. *Cf. l. c.*, p. 136.

[1] Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, June 28. [2] *Adv. Hæres.*, iii. 3.

must proceed more summarily with the rest of the pre-Constantinian period, as this is not the place for elaborate details on such a wide subject. If throughout the epoch in question the Church of Rome is ever receiving marks of veneration from members of the Church universal, it is especially against "the peremptory edicts" of its "bishop of bishops"[1] that her enemies point the finger of scorn. As St. Paul went up to Jerusalem "to see Peter,"[2] the most distinguished men in the Church went, like Origen, to Rome simply "to see this most ancient church."[3] Heretics, too, fluttered round it like moths round a candle, only to share their fate.[4] When other great churches differed from it, we find its pontiffs ordering their bishops to meet together in council, and threatening to cut them off "from the common unity, *τῆς κοινῆς ἑνώσεως*,"[5] if they continued to remain at variance with them. They called upon bishops

[1] Tertullian (fl. 243), as a rigorous Montanist writes (*De Pudicitia*, c. 1. *Cf.* c. 21): "Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex scilicet Maximus, quod est Episcopus Episcoporum dicit: 'Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentia functis dimitto.'" This is generally now supposed to have been written against Pope Callistus (218–22). It is the same Tertullian who, as a Catholic, appealed (*Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5) to the tradition of the Roman Church to which Peter and Paul left the Gospel "sealed with their blood"; and in his *De præscript. Hæret.*, c. 36, to that happy Church of Rome into which, with their blood, poured the whole teaching of Christ, and whence those in Africa could draw truth as from an authoritative source, "unde (Rome) nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est." Documents of *blessed* popes (for this is the style in which he speaks of the bishops of Rome, whether alive or dead) anterior to Zephyrinus (202–18), he calls 'authoritative,' *auctoritates præcessorum ejus. Adv. Praxeam*, i.

[2] Galatians i. 18.

[3] Ap. Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 14. See instances in Duchesne, *Les églises séparées*, p. 136. We also find Origen writing to Pope Fabian to justify his orthodoxy. *Cf.* Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 36.

[4] *Cf.* for examples, Newman's *Development of Christian Doctrine*, p. 157 ff.; Duchesne, p. 137.

[5] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 24.

even of the most important Sees to explain any doctrinal position which they had taken up, and which did not seem to them sound.[1] Finally, owing to their care for all the churches, and because they were "presidents of the great Christian congregation of love," they sent "contributions to many churches in every city."[2]

The pre-eminent position of the bishop of Rome was seen and acknowledged also by the civil authorities. The churches of the East were very much scandalised by the loose morals and equally loose doctrine of Paul of Samosata, then bishop of Antioch. He was at length condemned and deposed by numerous councils. Particulars of its proceedings were "by common consent addressed to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, and to Maximus of Alexandria," and sent to all the provinces. Paul, however, would not submit, but kept forcible possession of the temporalities of his See. The case was brought before the emperor Aurelian, who, says Eusebius, gave a most fair decision, ordering the church buildings to be given to those "to whom the Christian bishops of Italy and of Rome should write,[3] *i.e.* should send their *communicatory letters*."

Before a word is said on the position of the popes between the reign of Constantine and the days of St. Gregory I., with whose pontificate this work commences, it must be noted that though Rome was then indeed the capital of the world, the *principalitas* assigned to its bishops is never based during the earliest period of the Church's

[1] *Cf.* the case of Dionysius of Alexandria, ap. S. Athanasius, *De decretis Nicæn. synod.*, c. 26.

[2] The letter of Dionysius of Corinth to Pope Soter (168–177), ap. Euseb., iv. 23; *cf.* vii. 5. In the former passage Eusebius notes that the Roman practice of sending alms to the whole world was retained "even to the persecution of our day," viz., to the last of the great persecutions. *Cf.* Ep. 70 of St. Basil to Pope Damasus.

[3] Euseb., *l. c.*, vii. 27 ff.

life on anything but their descent from St. Peter. If the place of Pope Fabian was vacant, it was "the place of Peter"[1] that was empty.

The bishop of Rome in post-Nicene times.

If to the man whose clear sight enables him to penetrate the mists of remote antiquity ever so little, the *principality* of the bishops of Rome from the earliest ages is obvious, their commanding position after that date can scarcely escape the notice even of the man of dullest vision.[2]

As before, true doctrine is considered to be that which is in accord with the Roman tradition.[3] Communion with them is made the touchstone of orthodoxy,[4] the avenue of approach to Our Saviour.[5] Their power, said to be "derived from the authority of Holy Scripture,"[6] is acknowledged as well by councils, ecumenical[7] and particular,[8] as by individuals. If synods recognised[9] that appeals could be carried to them, they themselves proclaimed, five hundred years before the *False Decretals* were heard of, that from them there was no appeal, and that, being judged by none, they were to judge the whole Church.[10] Did they restore Greek bishops to the Sees from which they had been

[1] S. Cyprian, Ep. 55, n. 7, Antoniano.

[2] Hence J. M. Neale feels himself compelled to admit that the other patriarchs acknowledged "a priority of order, and perhaps, in the case of Rome, an undefined and undefinable something more, — a privilege of interference that might not have been brooked from another Patriarchal See." *A Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, p. 15.

[3] S. Augustine, Ep. 53, 2, where he gives a list of the bishops of Rome to his contemporary Anastasius; Optatus of Mileve, l. ii. c. 2, 3, where there is a similar list down to his contemporary Siricius.

[4] S. Ambrose, *De excidio Satyri*, i. 47; S. Jerome, Ep. 15, etc.

[5] S. Augustine, ap. *Nova Pat. Bib.*, vi. 546. "Communicet Petro qui vult partem habere cum Christo."

[6] See the letter of the Council of Mileve (416) to Pope Innocent I.

[7] *Cf.* the acts of the Councils of Ephesus (431) and of Chalcedon (451).

[8] See the acts of the Council of Aquileia (381), of Carthage (416), etc.

[9] *Cf.* can. 3 of Sardica, an. 347.

[10] Ep. of Gelasius to Faustus, ap. Jaffé, 622 (381).

expelled, Greek historians proclaimed that it was in virtue "of the prerogatives of the Roman Church."[1] We find that ecumenical councils were only summoned with their concurrence, that they presided over them by their legates, and were called upon by them to confirm their decrees.[2] Finally the pre-eminence of the Roman Pontiff is set forth most unmistakably in both the civil[3] and in the canon[4] law, or in that combination of both known as the Nomocanon, of the Greeks.[5]

Of course it was to have been expected that when freedom from persecution allowed of free and open inter-

[1] *Cf.* Socrates, *H. E.*, ii. 15, and Sozomen, *H. E.*, iii. 8, on the action of Pope Julius (337–352).

[2] On this last point read especially the acts of the Council of Chalcedon.

[3] The codices of emperor after emperor from Valentinian I. to Justinian proclaimed the primacy of the popes, and decreed that all their subjects must remain in that faith which St. Peter taught to the Romans. Ranke (*Lives of the Popes*, i. p. 7, Bohn's ed.) quotes the decree of Theodosius I. to this effect. It ran thus: "Cunctos populos quos nostræ clementiæ regit imperium in tali volumus religione versari, quam d. Petrum ap. tradidisse Romanis, religio usque ad huc ab ipsò insinuata declarat." Translated into Greek, it was transferred direct to the Nomocanon, and begins, Πάντας τοὺς ὑπηκόους, etc. Ap. Pitra, *Juris eccles. Græcorum Hist. et Monument.*, ii. p. 458.

[4] Among the eighty-seven capitula of John III. (†577), patriarch of Constantinople, for his skill in law known as the *Scholastic* and as the Father of Greek Canon Law, there is one setting forth the superiority of the bishop of Rome to all other bishops. Following the Novel. 131, c. 1, of Justinian, it proclaims that adhering to the councils from Nice to Chalcedon: Θεσπίζομεν, κατὰ τοὺς αὐτῶν ὅρους, τὸν ἁγιώτατον τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης πρόεδρον εἶναι πάντων τῶν ἱερέων. Pitra, *ib.*, p. 395. Elsewhere (in an article on the Canons of the Greek Church at the end of Ceillier, *Hist. des auteurs ecclés.*, t. xii., p. 1000) he says that the best Greek canonists have denied, or at least thought of doubtful legality, the independent primacy which the patriarchs of Constantinople have assumed over the East.

[5] For further information on this whole subject, see Newman's *Development*; Allies, *St. Peter, his Name and Office*; Livius, *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome*; Allnatt, *Cathedra Petri*; Murphy, *The Chair of Peter*; *A Catholic Dictionary*, art. *Pope*, etc.

course between the churches, and when the headquarters of the bishops of Rome were transferred from the catacomb of S. Priscilla to the Lateran palace, we should have had much more abundant evidence of the general acknowledgment of the primacy of the popes. And it was also to have been anticipated that with the passing of time the intervention of the Head of the Church in its affairs would be more frequent and more striking, as in the human body the action of the mind becomes more pronounced with its growth. But if the headship of the popes is seen in clearer light in the days that followed Constantine than in those which preceded them, his authority was not so uncontested. In the earlier period he had not to contend against imperial patriarchs at once heretical[1] and ambitious. Still, though either in matters of faith or judicial jurisdiction, their authority had been braved for a time by different patriarchs of Constantinople up to the period of which we are now treating, the Greek Church had always in the end come into agreement with them. And when S. Ignatius was dethroned by Photius there was absolute unity between the two churches.[2] We will now proceed to examine in detail how the assaults of his predecessors against it enabled Photius to effect an irreparable breach in it.

Rise of the Bishop of Constantinople. Nectarius.

At first, as we have already said, the bishops of Constantinople were subject to the jurisdiction of the exarch of Heraclea. For, though to preserve external unity the greater ecclesiastics had to be recognised by the bishops of Rome, they had jurisdiction over the bishops of their

[1] In the five hundred years from Eusebius to John VII. (832–842) there were no less than nineteen heretical patriarchs of Constantinople.

[2] Hence Amalarius of Metz († *c.* 838) tells of the singing of lessons at Rome and Constantinople in both Greek and Latin, "propter unanimitatem utriusque populi." *De offic. eccles.*, l. ii. *init.* (*P. L.*, t. 105). *Cf.* Ep. 86 Nich., and *L. P.*, in vit. Bened. III., n. xxxii.

respective provinces. But the ambition[1] of the bishops of *New Rome*, as their episcopal city was called, did not suffer this subjection long. In 381, Nectarius, the successor of St. Gregory Nazianzen, induced the fathers of the first general council of Constantinople to decree that "the bishop[2] of Constantinople holds the primacy of honour (τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς) after the bishop of Rome, *because it is the new Rome*." The ground on which this new honour was bestowed on Nectarius was more reprehensible than the granting of the honour itself, as far as the real, if not the nominal, prejudice of the rights of others was concerned. By the canon preceding the one just cited, the rights of *jurisdiction* belonging to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and to the three exarchs of Ephesus, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Heraclea were confirmed in accordance with the decrees of Nice. But as a matter of fact, however, as we gather from Socrates,[3] the bishops of Constantinople from this time forth exercised the jurisdiction that previously belonged to Heraclea; and, by judiciously stretching the third canon above mentioned, began to interfere in matters of ecclesiastical government throughout the entire East. The third canon was, however, not confirmed by the Holy See. Pope Leo I. wrote[4] to Anatolius (449–458) to the effect that this canon was null from the very beginning, as it had never been communicated to the Holy See, and that the use to which there was a wish to put it was both late in the day and to no purpose.

[1] Even the Greek *Liber Synodicus*, ap. Mai, *Spicil. Rom.*, vii. p. xxix, expressed fear as to where their ambition to have all the privileges of old Rome would lead them.

[2] Can. 3.

[3] *Hist.*, v. 8.

[4] *Ep. ad Anatol.*, May 22, 452. *Cf.* St. Gregory I. "Ecclesia Romana eosdem canones, vel gesta illius synodi hactenus non habet nec accipit. In hoc autem eamdem synodum accepit quod est per eam contra Macedonium definitum." Ep. vii. 31 (34), ad Eulogium, ep. Alex. et Anast., ep. Antioch.

Atticus. But the patriarchs of Constantinople pushed on their usurpations. Atticus (406–425), the second successor of St. John Chrysostom, turned to the civil power, and obtained two decrees in his favour from Theodosius, the younger. By the one, no bishop was for the future to be elected throughout the *three* exarchates without the consent of the synod of Constantinople.[1] By the other,[2] no affair in Illyricum was to be concluded without first informing the bishop of the city of Constantinople, *which city boasts the privileges of old Rome.* Still there is the same secular motive. But this time the usurpation of authority is in a province directly subject to Rome, through the vicariate of Thessalonica. The latter of these laws was indeed revoked, but not so the ambition of the bishops of the imperial city.

Anatolius. Anatolius contrived to get various canons passed in favour of his See at the general council of Chalcedon (451). Canons nine and seventeen permitted of appeals to the See of Constantinople from the exarchates; and canon twenty-eight, which was drawn up clandestinely and only received the signatures of under a third of the bishops, set forth that they confirmed the third canon of Constantinople and took the same view "of the privileges of the most holy Church of Constantinople, the new Rome. For to the throne of old Rome, on *account of its being the reigning city*, the fathers[3]

[1] *Cf.* Socrates, *Hist.*, vii. 28, where the election of one Dalmatius to the See of Cyzicum is narrated. "This they (the inhabitants of Cyzicum) did in contempt of a law which forbade their consecration of a bishop without the sanction of the bishop of Constantinople. But they held that that was a privilege granted to Atticus alone."

[2] *Cod. Theod.*, I. xv. tit. 2, leg. 45, quoted by Jager (p. xiv).

[3] As Duchesne laconically remarks (*Les églises*, p. 195), "Cette decision des Pères est encore à trouver." Westall, ap. *Dublin Review*, January 1903, notes (p. 109) that *the Fathers* here "mean the apostles and their successors, the apostles as the original donors, their successors as bearing witness to what was handed down."

naturally gave the privileges of honour (*τὰ πρεσβεῖα*); and, acting from the same motive, the 150 fathers (of the council of Constantinople) have assigned equal privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome, rightly deciding that the city, which was honoured with the residence of the emperor and the senate, should enjoy equal privileges with the older imperial Rome, and in ecclesiastical affairs be exalted like her, and after her hold the second place (*δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν*)." Hence the metropolitans of the exarchates and bishops among the barbarians were to be consecrated by the 'archbishop' of Constantinople, as he is now called. These three canons, combined with the third canon of Constantinople, or with the interpretation put upon it by the ambition of the bishops of the imperial city, would have had the effect of giving patriarchal rights to the 'archbishop' of Constantinople, and of placing him above the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, and all because of the civil position of his See. In their synodical letter[1] to Pope Leo I., the bishops of the council make known to him what they have done with regard to the bishop of Constantinople, "not so much for the sake of granting a privilege to the See of Constantinople as to provide for the due tranquillity of the metropolitan cities"; and beg the Pope to confirm (*περιπτύξασθαι*) what they have decided. But by letters[2] to the bishops of the council, to Anatolius himself, and to the emperor, Leo made it perfectly plain that such a confirmation he would not give. On the contrary, he annulled what the bishops had agreed upon "contrary to the rules of the holy canons drawn up at Nicæa," and "by the authority of the Blessed

[1] Printed at the end of the acts of the council; "non tam sedi Constantinopolitanæ aliquid præstantes quam metropolitanis urbibus quietem congruam providentes."

[2] *Ubi sup.* "S. Syndoum . . . . in occasionem ambitus trahas." Ep. ad Anatol.

Apostle Peter, by a general definition, made it utterly void."[1] In his letter to Anatolius, he upbraids him for using to further his own ambition a council called to settle matters of faith; and declares that what he desires will never receive his consent. And writing to the emperor Marcian he says that Anatolius ought to be content with the bishopric of Constantinople which he has obtained[2] by the favour of the emperor and the assent of the Pope. Although Anatolius in his reply to the Pope submitted to his decision, threw all the blame of the matter on the fathers of the council, and acknowledged that the canon had no force except from the confirmation of the Pope,[3] his successors did not cease to strive for the prize that was so nearly in their grasp.

Acacius.

Pope Felix III. found it necessary to depose Acacius (471–489) for his ambitious interference with the patriarchal rights of Antioch. Acacius in turn, trusting of course to the secular arm, excommunicated the Pope, and thus effected a schism. Although several of the successors of Acacius tried to induce the popes to confirm their election, as they would not efface the name of the schismatic

[1] Ep. ad Pulcheriam. "Consensiones epp. . . . . in irritum mittimus, et, per auctoritatem B. Petri Ap., generali prorsus definitione cassimus."

[2] "Satis sit prædicto, quod vestræ pietatis auxilio et mei favoris assensu episcopatum tantæ urbis obtinuit. . . . Non dedignetur *regiam* civitatem, quam *apostolicam* non potest facere sedem." Ep. ad Marcian.

[3] Ep. 132, among the letters of Pope Leo; "cum et sic gestorum vis omnis et confirmatio auctoritati vestræ beatitudinis fuerit reservata." See a very useful article on "The Fathers gave Rome the Primacy," by Westall, in the *Dublin Review*, January 1903. Considering that "to some extent even the wording" of can. 28 is drawn from language of the Pope himself, Westall believes that "whatever *arrière pensée* may have been in the minds" of its framers, "it was most certainly intended to bear an acceptable interpretation to the Pope, St. Leo," p. 101. Even the Greek *Liber Synodicus* (ap. Mai, *Spicil. Rom.*, p. xxv, says that through Leo's condemnation of the absurd novelty (τὸ τῆς καινοτομίας ἄτοπον), the canon at once became a dead letter (ἀπραγτησαντες εὐθέως).

Acacius from the sacred diptychs, they did not obtain their request, and as many as five of the successors of Acacius died out of communion with the See of Rome. The schism was healed in 519, in the reign of Pope Hormisdas, and yet the emperor Justinian (527–565) in his new code of laws [1] reaffirmed the high place of the See of Constantinople.

John, the Faster.

Then John the Faster (582–595) essayed at least indirectly a higher flight. He arrogated to himself the title of 'ecumenical patriarch,' and, despite the remonstrances of Pelagius II. and Gregory I.,[2] who wrote to point out to him that to take such a title was tantamount to calling himself the only bishop, he and his successors held to the title. Tending in the same direction, viz., in that of making the bishop of Constantinople no longer the second but the first in the Church, was the thirty-sixth canon which was decreed by the Greek bishops in the Council of Trullo (692), which, while professing to renew the third canon of Constantinople and the twenty-eighth of Chalcedon, declared that the See of Constantinople should enjoy the same privileges as that of old Rome, and that it should be as great in ecclesiastical affairs, holding the second rank after it.

The outline just sketched of the respective positions of Rome and Constantinople is in the main endorsed by the conclusions of the latest English non-Catholic writer on the affairs of the Eastern Roman Empire, viz., Mr. Bury. Speaking of a period much anterior to that of Nicholas I., he writes[3]: "The bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, was the head of the Church, and the weakness of the empire in the West increased his power and confirmed his independence. . . . But the geographical distance from Constantinople had also another effect; it contributed to rendering the patriarch of Constantinople

[1] *Novell*, 131, c. 1. [2] *Cf.* vol. i., pt. i., p. 137 ff. of this work.
[3] *The Later Roman Empire*, i. 186.

and the Eastern churches independent of Rome. The oriental and occidental churches had a tendency to separate along with the political systems to which they belonged, and consistent with this tendency was the desire of the patriarch of Constantinople, which in the fifth century became the most important city in the world, to free himself from the jurisdiction of Rome. In order to to do so he naturally leaned upon the power of the emperor. The result was that in the West the ecclesiastical hierarchy was independent in spiritual matters, and afterwards attained secular power, but in the East the Church and the Imperium were closely allied, the Church being dependent on the emperor."

The long series of ambitious efforts for pride of place on the part of his predecessors had well paved the way for the schism of Photius, which was the beginning of the end of the union between the Greeks and the Latins, between the East and the West. But it was reserved for his craft to give point to the growing divergence between the East and West by inventing a doctrinal basis for that divergence.

We must now, therefore, unfold the history of his relations with the Holy See, which, if we include the affair of Gregory Asbestas, with which the story of Photius is intimately bound up, embraced a period of thirty-four years, and involved nine popes, beginning with Leo IV. and ending with Formosus, and five councils.

Photius.

On the death of the emperor Theophilus, as his son Michael was a minor, the government of the empire was placed in the hands of a council of regency, of which the empress-mother Theodora was the head. To assist her were appointed three of the most important men in the State. Of these the first in intelligence, in enterprise, and in crime was the patrician Bardas, the emperor's uncle and the brother of Theodora. Their secretary was Photius,

himself connected with the imperial family by the marriage of one of his uncles with a sister of Theodora. The lust of Bardas was the immediate cause not only of the downfall of the council of regency, but of that of Ignatius, and of the union between the East and West. To the great scandal of all, he repudiated his lawful wife to live with his daughter-in-law, who had been left a young widow. Despite the life of sin in which he was publicly[1] known to be living, he had the effrontery to present himself to receive Holy Communion at the hands of the patriarch on the feast of the Epiphany 857. Ignatius, who had to no purpose oft warned him to give up his evil courses, openly refused to give him the Body and Blood[2] of Our Lord. Bardas resolved on revenge; but for that he had to make himself supreme. He had already acquired a paramount influence over the young Michael, who had very early manifested a strong inclination to every form of ignoble vice. By encouraging him in his vile habits of drink, of associating with stablemen, and of buffoonery, Bardas had made the weak and wicked youth his tool. He accordingly persuaded the young libertine of nineteen that he was now old enough to rule by himself, and advised him to order the patriarch[3] to cut off the hair of Theodora and make her enter a convent. Naturally impatient of any control, the advice was eagerly acted upon by Michael. And as Ignatius firmly refused to be a party to this iniquity, he incurred, to the profound satisfaction of Bardas, the hatred of the emperor also. What Ignatius had refused to do was done by a baser soul, and Theodora

[1] "Ut ejus rei fama totam urbem peragraret." Nicetas, *in vit. Ig.*

[2] "Hic fons ecclesiasticæ perturbationis." *Ib.* Change these names into those of Henry VIII., Anne Boleyn, and Cranmer, and you have "the origin of the ecclesiastical disturbance" in England in the sixteenth century.

[3] Nicetas, *ib.*

was shut up in a convent (September 857). Next a charge of high treason was trumped up by Bardas against Ignatius,[2] and the saint was banished to the Isle of Terebinth, the most wretched of the Princes' Isles (November 23, 857). Bardas, who was now the real ruler of the empire (he was soon to take the title of Cæsar[1]), determined to replace Ignatius by one who would at once do his will and be a support to him. He resolved that Photius, who was anything but loath, should be patriarch. Every effort was at first made to induce Ignatius to resign.[2] This, with the same inflexibility in right which he had shown before, he firmly refused to do. That device failing, Bardas, so it is said, by craftily offering in private the patriarchal See to each of the professed chief supporters of Ignatius, should they abandon him, suborned their fidelity to the saint. The choice of Photius was then made public, and in six days he was made from monk to patriarch (Christmas Day, 857), by Gregory Asbestas, to whose party both Bardas and Photius had attached themselves. All this Bardas accomplished in less than twelve months. Of the new would-be patriarch, Jager[3] writes as follows: "Photius united

[1] According to some authorities, in 860. But Finlay, following others, thinks it was in 862. *The Byzantine Emp.*, p. 219 n.

[2] Nicetas, *ib.* The sufferings which Bardas and Photius inflicted on the saint are well told by Schlumberger in the account which he gives of him in his pretty *Les Iles des Princes*, Paris, 1884, p. 254 ff. Yet Paparrigopoulo can callously write, p. 250: "The struggle between these two men was not personal." Photius was the embodiment of the spirit of reform. Ignatius "était le porte-drapeau de la foule, dévouée à l'ancien ordre des choses, à ses préjugés et à ses abus!"

[3] P. 20. He follows Nicetas very closely. Nicetas begins his description of Photius by calling him: "hominem sane minime obscurum et ignobilem, sed claris et illustribus oriundum natalibus, rerumque civilium et politicarum usu, prudentiaque et scientia clarissimum," etc., p. 1198. The quotations from Nicetas are in the Latin translation which accompanies the Greek text.

in his person the most eminent gifts which nature has ever bestowed on one man, a high intelligence, great genius, vivacity of spirit, a wonderful energy, an incredible activity, an ardent passion for glory, a will at once as supple as gold and as inflexible as iron. He had a pronounced taste for letters, and in their study passed his nights; he was a skilful orator and an accomplished writer in prose and verse, sometimes rising to the level of the ancients. He was master of all the learning of his own and preceding ages, and was in it more than a match for any disputant. Though no stranger to ecclesiastical learning, he did not excel in it. To so many qualities was joined an illustrious birth. Although (at this time) young, he was not without experience, as he had for some time been Secretary of State, after having been on various embassies to foreign states. Add to these distinctions an agreeable exterior, a grave and modest deportment, a bright expression, manners easy and elegant, perfect politeness, in a word, all the external qualifications which attract and seduce by an inexpressible charm. . . . . What was wanting to so many eminent qualities? Christian humility. . . . He was the slave of an indomitable pride and a gnawing ambition."[1]

Endeavours to force Ignatius to resign.

Such was Photius, who in virtue of his consecration by

[1] A writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xxi., p. 329, says: "He seems to have been very learned and very wicked—a great scholar and a consummate hypocrite—not only neglecting the occasions of doing good which presented themselves, but perverting the finest talents to the worst purposes." Writers of to-day give similar estimates of the character of Photius. *Cf.* Schlumberger, *Les Iles des Princes*, p. 269; Marin, *Les moines de Constant.*, L. iii. c. 3. If full reliance could be placed on the narrative of Symeon Magister, or rather on that of the Pseudo-Symeon, a chronicler of the tenth century, Photius, even as patriarch, was as lax in his morals as Michael himself, and was as hard a drinker as Martin Luther. *Cf.* his account *De Michaele et Theodora*, c. 19. On the confusion as to the works of *Symeon*, see Bury's *Gibbon*, v. 503.

Gregory, and of the power of a tyrant, called himself patriarch of Constantinople. He at once renewed his ill-treatment[1] of Ignatius in order to force him to resign; and, knowing that a generous soul is most hurt in the sufferings of his friends, the supporters of the saint were subjected to similar outrages. One cannot help thinking of a like device practised by Henry II. to break the spirit of St. Thomas of Canterbury. But not to no purpose had Ignatius received in his veins the blood of kings from both his father and mother. What is more, he had been brought up in that school wherein especially are trained *men*, the school of adversity. Ignatius could not be crushed by aught that Photius could do. And although the pseudo-patriarch made every effort to put his own friends in power wherever he could, there was so much opposition to him that, if any trust can be placed in his letters to Bardas, he was really distressed at the position he was in. But pride, and, possibly, the fear of Bardas, prevented him from taking the one step—viz., that of giving up his pretensions, which could alone have brought him peace of mind. The support which he could not win by violence at home, he next decided to try and gain by craft from abroad. He endeavoured to procure the confirmation[2] of his election from Rome.

[1] Besides the narrative of Nicetas, *cf.* a letter of Metrophanes (metropolitan of Smyrna, and one of the few who from the beginning offered some opposition to Photius) to the patrician Manuel, who had asked him for particulars of the deposition of Photius. It is printed as one of the appendices to the eighth General Council, ap. Labbe, viii. p. 1386. The letter of Stylian of Neocesarea has already been quoted. Printed in front of the acts of the same council (*ib.*, p. 1259 f.) is the *Encomium* of S. Ignatius, written by the monk Michael, priest and chaplain (*syncellus*).

[2] "Quatenus illa (sede apostolica), sicut ipse sperabat, approbante, mox omnium ora resistentium obstructa silerent." Anast., *in præfat. Synod. VIII.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 12; Nicetas, too (*in vit. Ig.*, p. 1203), says that the real object of the embassy which was sent to Rome was

Accordingly an important embassy, consisting of the *protaspatharius* (captain of the guards), Arsaber and four bishops,[1] was sent to Rome with great presents and with letters for the Pope from the emperor and Photius. The letter of Photius, besides presenting his profession of faith, gave an account of his elevation to the See of Constantinople. He did not blush therein[2] to declare that he was overwhelmed to find himself burdened with an office which he had always regarded as too much for human shoulders to bear. For "when[3] my predecessor left his charge," (so euphemistically does he describe the expulsion of Ignatius), the bishops, and especially the emperor, whom he basely asserts to be unsurpassed in leniency by any who have ruled before him, forced him to take up the burden of the episcopacy. With the Pope, therefore, he is resolved to contract a firm alliance of faith and love. In conclusion, he makes the usual profession of faith, declares his acceptance of the seven general councils, and begs the Pope's prayers that he may show himself a worthy bishop. The emperor's letter, the contents of which have to be gleaned from the letters of Nicholas, allows that certain disorders followed on the resignation of Ignatius, and begs the Pope to send legates to Constantinople to put an end to them as well as to the remains of the iconoclast trouble.

Tries to obtain confirmation from Rome, 860.

But Nicholas was neither to be bought nor befooled; and "although[4] up to this he was ignorant of the crafty ways of Photius, he keenly surmised almost the whole

Action of Nicholas.

that the deposition of Ignatius, "Romanæ ecclesiæ auctoritate firmaret(ur)." *Cf.* the *Libellus Synodicus*, ap. Labbe, viii. pp. 652–4.

[1] *Cf. L. P., in vit.*; the preface to Anastasius' translation of the acts of the eighth General Council; Ep. Nich., 104.

[2] Jager gives this letter in both the original Greek and French.

[3] *Ib.*, "τοῦ πρὸ ἡμῶν ἱερατεύειν λαχόντος, τῆς τοιαύτης ὑπεξελθόντος ἀξίας."

[4] Anast., *in Præfat.*, and *L. P., l. c.* Metrophanes (ap. Labbe, 1387) expressly states that not one of the friends of Ignatius was allowed to go to Rome.

truth." He assembled a council to discuss the matter, and it was decided that two legates, Rodoald, bishop of Porto, and Zachary, bishop of Anagni, should be sent to Constantinople. Nicholas gave them the strictest injunctions with regard to the affair of Ignatius. They had merely to inform themselves of the facts of the case, to report them to the Apostolic See, and meanwhile only to communicate[1] with Photius as a layman. The legates were the bearers of two letters.

Letters of the Pope, Sept. 25, 860.

In a short[2] one to Photius, Nicholas rejoices that his profession of faith shows him to be a Catholic, but cannot but regret his allowing himself, a layman, to be consecrated patriarch, and hence "cannot consent to his consecration" till the return of the legates. In a longer one[3] to Michael (the letters of Nicholas are not unfrequently decidedly long), he points out that it is by the will of Christ, Our Lord, that the Church is founded on Peter, and while thanking Michael for his wish for peace, reminds him that the Fathers have taken notice "that no decision must be given on any new matter that arises without the consent of the Roman See and the Roman Pontiff." Hence Ignatius ought not to have been deposed "without consultation with the Roman Pontiff," still less ought a layman to have been elected patriarch, a pro-

[1] *Cf. L. P.*, nn. xx. and xxxviii., and the letters of the Pope to the clergy of Constantinople, etc. (ad an. 866, Epp. 104, 106). As though to protest against the lying efforts of Photius to conceal the truth, Nicholas repeats in every letter in which he deals with his conduct the whole history of his dealings with the unscrupulous patriarch. These letters are numbered in Migne, 4, 11, 13, 86, 98, 104, 105, 106, which last includes Ep. 46 and part of 86. There is wonderful unanimity between the Eastern and Western authorities on the doings of Photius.

[2] Ep. 5.

[3] Ep. 4. "A quibus (patribus) et deliberatum ac observatum existit, qualiter absque Romanæ Sedis, Romanique pontificis consensu, nullius insurgentis deliberationis terminus daretur."

ceeding condemned as well by the Council of Sardica as by the decrees of the popes. Until, therefore, his envoys have informed him of all that has been done, "he cannot give the consent of his apostleship" to the consecration of Photius. On the image question, he continues, there is no need for him to write much, as it has been settled, and there are at Constantinople the letters of Pope Hadrian. He concludes by exhorting the emperor, who, he is given to understand, is anxious for the proper ordering of all ecclesiastical affairs, to restore to the Holy See its patriarchal rights over the provinces of Illyricum and Sicily, and the patrimonies that belonged to it in Calabria and Sicily.

Ill-treatment of the legates, 861.

When the Pope's legates reached Constantinople, and the authorities there found that the deposition of Ignatius was not approved by Rome, they determined to wring approval at least from Rome's representatives. The legates were ill-treated, threatened, and imprisoned, with the view of forcing them to betray their trust. They resisted for months.[1] At length, when they had been tried with gold as well as iron, they consented to become the tools of Photius.[2] To imitate the first general council of Nice, 318 bishops were got together in council (May 861). They assembled in the Church of the Holy Apostles, situated in the centre of the city by the imperial cemetery, and afterwards destroyed by Mohammed II., the Conqueror, to make room for the mosque which bears his name.

[1] Metrophanes. *Cf.* Ep. 12, and the other letters of the Pope cited above.

[2] However, in his *preface* to his translation of the Acts of the eighth General Council, Anastasius ascribes the fall of the legates only to fear "potius præ vi ac timore deficientibus." Zachary was of noble birth, a relation of Pope Stephen (V.) VI., and, according to Lapôtre (*Le Souper de Jean Diacre*, p. 335 ff. On this work, *cf. infra*, p. 149), was good and true. John, the Deacon (*Epil. ad cœnam*), likens him to Job. "Quando simplex Job Formosum condempnabat subdolum."

Michael, who attended the synod himself, with the Roman legates and the bishops on his right, and many of the *senate* on his left, opened it by saying that it was merely out of respect for the Roman Church and for the most holy Pope Nicholas in the persons of his legates that the case of the deposed Ignatius could be gone into again. After the whole assembly had declared its submission to the ruling of the papal legates, a sham trial of the defenceless patriarch was instituted. Because he would not abdicate, despite all the pressure that could be brought to bear upon him, he was declared deposed on the futile charge of having accepted his office from the civil power. The saint, however, persisted in appealing to the Apostolic See. "Such judges[1] as you I do not recognise. Take me before the Pope, to his judgment I will gladly submit." Those who were well disposed to the saint made the same appeal. No notice was, of course, taken of it. For form's sake a discussion was held on the image question. The Pope's letters, altered by Photius[2] to suit his requirements, were next read, and twenty-seven canons of discipline were passed. Stripped of his pallium, Ignatius returned into the hands of his persecutors, and the legates to Rome to gloss over their doings to Nicholas as best they could, with the aid of letters from the emperor and Photius which were entrusted to the care of Leo, a secretary of state.

Position of the See of Rome in the eyes of the Greeks.

Like the whole of the affair of Photius, the acts of this

[1] *Cf.* the memorial drawn up by Ignatius himself, which, as we shall see later, he managed to get taken to Nicholas by the monk Theognostus, Labbe, viii. 1266; Anast., *in vit. Nich.*, n. xl.; and an abridged account in Latin of this synod, ap. Deusdedit, *Collect. Can.*, ed. Martinucci, p. 505 f. The Greek text of the council is lost.

[2] This Nicholas frequently asserts in his letters, sometimes giving specimens of their re-editing. *Cf.* Epp. 98, 13; Anast., *in præfat.*, writes: "Græci epistolas suscipientes quidquid in eis erat pro Ignatio vel contra Photium inverterunt, subtraxerunt, et in consilio legi minime pertulerunt."

synod illustrate very plainly the relation of the whole Greek Church to the See of Rome. The supreme authority of the papal legates is recognised both by Ignatius[1] and his supporters and by the adherents of Photius. All acknowledged the right of appeal to Rome,[2] and the consequent right of the Pope to try over again any cases whatsoever which might be brought before him.[3] And if, at last, seeing how false they were to their trust, the holy patriarch would not recognise the papal legates, it was because they had not been sent "by the great judge, the Pope of Rome" (a magno judice P. Rom.), *i.e.*, because they were not acting as his faithful missi.

Letters of the emperor and Photius to Nicholas, 861.

The emperor's letter informs the Pope of the council held at Constantinople, and of the deposition of Ignatius by virtue of its decree and the consent of the papal legates. The Pope's assent to the council is asked, and the elevation of Photius defended by an appeal to precedent in the cases of S. Ambrose, etc. The letter[4] of Photius, necessarily long, as its object was to mislead the Pope, is a masterpiece of sophistical reasoning and special pleading, and well worthy of the study of a barrister. The writer begins

[1] "Qui hoc (the judgment of the legates) non recipit," say the supporters of the Saint, "nec apostolos recipit." *Synod.*, p. 507, ed. Martinucci.

[2] "Nostis," ask the papal legates, to whose question Ignatius assents, "quòd omnes damnati potestatem habent revocare causam suam in conspectu Papæ," etc. *Ib.*

[3] "Credite," ask the apocrisiarii, "fratres, quoniam S. patres decreverunt in Sardicense concilio, ut habeat potestatem Rom. Episcopus renovare causam cujuslibet episcopi, propterea nos per auctoritatem quam diximus ejus volumus investigare negotium. Theodorus ep. Laodiciæ dixit. et æcclesia nostra gaudet in hoc, et nullam habet contradictionem aut tristitiam."

[4] Printed in Greek and French in Jager. The portion of the *Greek* text at the end of the letter, which was not known to Jager, has been given to the world by Cardinal Mai, *Nov. Pat. Bib.*, iv. 50.

by saying that he quite understands that the first letter which the Pope wrote to him was the outcome of his zeal for what he supposed to be the right. But it must not be forgotten that the writer could not help his promotion, and that he certainly did not desire it. On the one hand, his happiness in his former life, upon which he enlarges at some length, was great; and on the other, he was thoroughly alive to the difficult character of the motley population of the imperial city, and how hard it would be to teach it the lessons of virtue. Still he hopes for the Pope's justice. He had not violated the canons[1] by his promotion, as they had not then been received by the Church of Constantinople. He does not, however, say all this to keep the See he never wanted. But he cannot approve of its being held by one (Ignatius) who had taken possession of it improperly, nor yet endure without a word being driven from a post even more harshly than he had been driven into it! Then, to defend his own elevation to the See, he very cleverly undertakes the defence of other laymen, like Nicephorus and Tarasius, who had, with great advantage to the Church, been made patriarchs of Constantinople. However, "to show obedience[2] in all things to your paternal charity" . . . . and "because children must obey their parents in what is right and holy," he has consented to the passing of a canon (can. 17) forbidding any layman or monk to be consecrated bishop without having passed through all the lower grades of the ecclesiastical order. He would have established all the rules laid down by the Pope had it not been for the resistance of the emperor. After highly praising the Pope's legates, he concludes by begging

[1] Nicholas had appealed to the canons of Sardica and to decretals of the popes.

[2] "ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τὸ πειθήνιον τῇ πατρικῇ ὑμῶν ἐπιδεικνύντες ἀγάπῃ . . . . Δεῖ γὰρ πατράσι τέκνα δίκαιόν τε καὶ ὅσιον πειθαρχεῖν." Ep. Phot.

Nicholas, "who[1] holds the primacy," mindful of the canons, not to receive those who come to Rome from Constantinople without letters of recommendation. This request was, of course, made by Photius in the hope of keeping Nicholas from finding out the truth in his regard.

The return of the legates to Rome, 862.

On the return of his legates to Rome (862), Nicholas had no difficulty in finding out, as well from their words as from the acts of the council held by Photius, and the letters of the emperor and the pseudo-patriarch, that his envoys had gone beyond their powers. In a council of the Roman clergy, in presence of the imperial ambassador, Nicholas blamed his legates for their conduct, and declared that he did not consent either to the deposition of Ignatius or to the promotion of Photius.[2]

Further letters of the Pope to Photius, etc.

In the spring (862) the envoy Leo returned to Constantinople with a letter[3] for the emperor and one for Photius, both to the same effect. Nicholas plainly informs Michael that, "because,[4] without the decision of our apostleship you have retained Photius and have expelled that most prudent man, the patriarch Ignatius, we wish you plainly to understand that we do not at all accept Photius nor condemn the patriarch Ignatius." Nor does he fail to remind the emperor that what he now says against Ignatius is very different to what he was wont to say in his praise during the course of well nigh twelve years after his election. The emperor's conduct in the affair "is more than we can bear with equanimity, especially as we had ordered that the dispute between the two should be

[1] "Πρωτεύων λαχοντα." *Ib.*

[2] *Cf.* Anast., *in vit.*, and the letters (12 and 13, etc.) of Nicholas.

[3] Epp. 12 and 13.

[4] Ep. 13, dated March 19, 862. "At quia nunc Photium retinentes, prudentissimum virum Ignatium patriarcham absque nostri apostolatus judicio ejecistis, nosse vos omnimodis volumus, nullatenus nos Photium recipere, vel Ignatium patriarcham damnare."

investigated and reported to us, but not decided." That decision the Pope will not give "till the truth is made clear in our presence."

Nicholas begins his letter[1] to Photius, whom he simply addresses as "a most prudent man," by establishing the authority of his See over the whole Church. "In the Church,[2] Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and janitor of the kingdom of heaven, merited to have the primacy, as is known to all the faithful, and has been briefly shown above (by the words of Our Lord: 'Thou art Peter,' etc.). After him, his vicars, sincere servers of God, free from the mists which are wont to cause men to wander from the right path, have received the same privilege, and have steadily persevered in the government of the Lord's sheep which has been entrusted to them." Over this Roman Church, from which "all the faithful seek the integrity of the faith," he has been placed. Hence what he decides "with full authority" must be observed, and Photius has done wrong in taking the patriarchal dignity, inasmuch as he is a layman, and Ignatius still lives. Nicholas then shows that there were special circumstances connected with the uncanonical elevation of S. Ambrose and the others to whom Photius had appealed. With regard to the assertion of Photius that the Church of Constantinople had not recognised the Council of Sardica nor received the decretals, Nicholas flatly declares that "he can scarcely believe it." The Council of Sardica, he says, was held in your parts, and has been received by the whole Church. Why, then, should the Church of Constantinople reject it? Moreover, how is it that you have not

[1] Ep. 12, March 18, 862.

[2] "Cujus (ecclesiæ) primatum (sicut omnibus orthodoxis manifestum est viris, et ut in superioribus prælibatum declaratum est) b. Petrus princeps App. et janitor regni cælestis merito promeruit." Ep. 12.

received the decretals of the Roman Church "by the authority[1] of which all councils receive their weight"—except that they contradict your ordination? If you have them not, you are careless; if you have them, and do not observe them, you are blameworthy. Until the fault of Ignatius is made evident to us, we can neither regard him as deposed, nor you as even in the sacerdotal order.

Nicholas writes to all the East.

Not content with these plain declarations of his views on the subject of the existing phase of the affair of Ignatius, he explained[2] them to those "who govern the Catholic churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and to all the Eastern metropolitans and bishops"; and "by apostolic authority" he ordered them to take up the same attitude towards the respective rights of Ignatius and Photius as he did, and to make known his letter throughout all their dioceses.[3]

Up to this Nicholas was quite ignorant both of the extent of the guilt of his legates and of the vile treatment which had from the first been meted out to Ignatius. He was soon to learn of both.

The appeal of Ignatius.

After his condemnation by the Council of Photius, Ignatius was exposed to even more shameful[4] treatment than he had experienced before it, in order to make him sign his abdication. But neither chains, blows, nor tortures of any kind could wring the desired deed of renunciation from

[1] *Ib.* "Cujus (Romanæ ecclesiæ) auctoritate, atque sanctione omnes synodi, et sancta concilia roborentur et stabilitatem sumunt."

[2] Ep. 11.

[3] *Ib.* "Et ut vos . . . . nobiscum super ven. Ignatii sacerdotii recuperatione, et Photii pervasoris expulsione eadem sentiatis, apostolica auctoritate vobis injungimus atque jubemus. Et ut hujus præsulatus nostri paginam in cunctis parochiis vestris ad omnium faciatis notitiam pervenire . . . . paterno more præcipimus." It is surely superfluous to point out what position this supposes Nicholas to have held over the East.

[4] Nicetas, p. 1207 f., and the assertions of Ignatius at the end of his 'appeal.'

him. Having obtained a little respite, he at once drew up an appeal to the Pope, an appeal which was signed by ten metropolitans, fifteen bishops, and a large number of the clergy. It was addressed "to our most holy lord and blessed president (*προέδρῳ*), the patriarch of all the Sees, the successor of the apostles, the œcumenical Pope Nicholas," and to the Roman Church. In it Ignatius sets forth his case, such as we have seen it, and in conclusion adds: "Do you,[1] most holy lord, show pity to me, and with the great apostle say, 'Who is weak, and I am not weak?' (2 Cor. xi. 29). Think of thy predecessors Fabian, Julius, Innocent, Leo, and all of those who nobly struggled for the faith and truth. Emulate them and avenge me, who have suffered such unworthy treatment." This document the monk Theognostus[2] managed in disguise to carry to the Pope. He reached Rome probably towards the close of the year 862.

The council of Nicholas, 863.

Now in possession of the full truth, Nicholas was indignant indeed, and he resolved to make his indignation felt. A numerous council was promptly convoked.[3] It met first in the Church of St. Peter, and then, on account[4]

[1] The closing words of the appeal, Labbe, viii. 1270. Those who fled to Rome to escape persecution at the hands of the party of Photius confirmed the 'appeal' of Ignatius. Ep. 106, Nich.

[2] Stylian's letter, p. 1402.

[3] Anast., *in vit.*, et *in Præfat.*; Metrophanes, etc. On this synod and on the earlier history of this affair, the *Liber Synodicus* (ap. Labbe, viii. 652 f.) may be consulted. On the *Liber S.* itself, see vol. i., pt. i., p. 379 n. of this work. The acts of the council are given at most length in the letters of Nicholas, Ep. 104, Ad clerum Constant.; and Ep. 106 (which includes those numbered 46 and 86, in part, in *P. L.*), Ad universos Catholicos, both belonging to the year 866.

[4] Ep. 106. Jager, from the words "propter frigidiorem locum," infers the superior warmth of the Lateran and that the council was being held in the winter; I, however, think that, as the words are connected with the Lateran, the Lateran was the cooler place and that summer had set in. *Cf.* Hare, *Walks in Rome*, i. p. 9., ed. 1900, on the coldness of the Lateran.

of the weather, in that of the Lateran. The legate Zachary was at once tried for his conduct at Constantinople. When convicted he was deprived of his bishopric and excommunicated. Rodoald, who was then absent on duty as legate in the affair of the divorce of King Lothaire, and who proved as faithless in that charge as in his former, was recalled at the close of this year, and then shared the same well-deserved fate as his colleague. Photius was declared deprived of all sacerdotal rights, and threatened with perpetual excommunication if he attempted to exercise them or to interfere with the rights of Ignatius. The same sentence was decreed against Gregory of Syracuse, and those ordained by Photius were interdicted from performing any clerical duties. Ignatius, on the other hand, and his friends who had suffered with him, were reinstated in the honours of which they had been unjustly deprived. Any cleric or layman, of *whatever rank* (*quisquis est*), who may venture to interfere with the carrying out of the Pope's decrees is threatened with deposition or excommunication.

Its effect in the East.

To mitigate the effects of the previous council of the Pope, Photius had had recourse to forgery. But he gained nothing by it. The favourable letter which professed to have been written by Nicholas to him was proved to be suppositious.[1] This discovery did not naturally improve the light in which he was regarded by those who had any concern for virtue and honour. And when word reached Constantinople of his formal condemnation by the Pope and his council of 863, and it was seen that he took no heed of the condemnation, people broke off communion with him "in crowds,[2] being struck with horror that he

[1] Nicetas, p. 1215.

[2] "Cujus (sedis apost.) censuræ Photio minime parente, sacratus fidelium catalogus magis inflammatur, et ab ejus se communione enervatim sequestrat, horrescens quod nec a tanta sede perculsus corrigi consenserit." Anast., *in Præfat.*

would not take correction even from so great a See." Photius, however, was not the man to sit quiet while his cause was being attacked. Resistance, he endeavoured to overcome by force; support, to purchase by any means. "No profession,[1] age, or sex was left unpunished by him, if it was not in communion with him." To catch the good-will of the learned, he conducted a school in his palace, and spared neither his money nor his talents to gain partisans. With the same end, he scattered broadcast the most delicate attentions which his naturally most charming address enabled him to pay so attractively. No man ever understood better than Photius that "every man has his price." He even pandered to the lower orders, and induced curriers, needle-makers, and the like, to sign various documents suitable for his purposes—documents which were collected and burnt at the eighth General Council.[2] But especially did he strive to gain over the monks, who, headed by the Studites, had been the great allies of the popes in the iconoclast troubles, and now almost to a man opposed him resolutely. He had already affected a great zeal for their reform, and had passed various canons affecting them in his council of 861. But they were so framed that they could be made to serve his own ends. When they could not, he did not scruple to contravene his own handiwork.[3] Though, as we shall see, his herculean labours finally availed him nothing, they bore a lasting bad fruit. He had sowed so many seeds of distrust of Rome that a thousand years has not sufficed to uproot them.[4]

Concurrent affairs of the West.

All this while Nicholas was harassed in the West as well as in the East. Hincmar of Rheims was showing himself anything but docile with regard to the appeal of Rothad

[1] *Ib.* [2] *Cf.* eighth session, at the beginning.
[3] This Paparrigopoulo has quite failed to realise, p. 243.
[4] *Cf.* Marin, *Les moines*, pp. 157–60, and L. iii. c. 3.

of Soissons against him, and Lothaire of Lorraine was struggling to divorce his lawful wife, and was being supported in his struggle by the powerful archbishops of Trier and Cologne. The two latter, viz., Gunther and Theutgard, in their violent opposition to the Pope, endeavourd to make matters unbearable for him by trying to bring about an understanding with Photius.[1] He, however, when he received this invitation, was either not ready to act, or had not made up his mind to try all extremities. Probably the former alternative contains the true explanation of the lull in the course of his violent actions.

Photius decides to break with Rome.

Convinced at length that he could not bend to his will either Nicholas or Ignatius, and that the time had come, Photius decided to break away definitely from both. By making the fullest use of his personal influence and his power at court, he had rendered the number of his creatures in places of position and trust very considerable. He made a "beginning of the end" by writing, through the emperor Michael, a letter (865) to the Pope full of abuse.

Correspondence between the Pope and the East re-opened, 865.

The very lengthy reply of Nicholas to this letter, now lost, will give a sufficiently clear idea of its contents. When the letter arrived, the Pope was very ill,[2] but by a great effort he contrived to pen an answer for the imperial envoy to take back to his master, an answer "which has remained an invaluable source of Canon Law, which historians of all countries have praised for its dignity and prudence, and which some regard as the grandest and most

[1] Jager, p. 111. At least it is supposed that the passage in the encyclical of Photius against the Pope and the West (to be spoken of presently, and which is the second letter of Photius in the London ed. of 1651), in which he states that he has received a letter from Italy calling on him for succour against the tyrannical authority of the Pope, refers to the manifesto of the two archbishops against him. See on p. 65.

[2] "Ægritudine nimia pressi." Ep. 86 (Migne, pp. 926–962).

elevated document which has been written up to this day on the privileges of the Church."[1]

As the letter purported to come from the emperor, to him Nicholas addressed his reply, though he declares more than once that he does not believe that Michael is the author of it. To the personal abuse of himself, with which the emperor's letter began, Nicholas commences his reply by asserting that he will only oppose prayers that Our Lord will teach him what is in accordance with truth and increase his power. He reminds the emperor that as Christ Our Lord commanded the Jews to harken to the scribes because they sat in the chair of Moses, he ought still more to give heed to him as he was sitting in the chair of Peter, and ought not to consider the person of the Pope, but his doctrine.

"But as to what you have written which tends to the injury (not of me but) of the Roman Church, to the diminution of its privileges and to the lowering of its bishops, that we shall rebut with all our power, and, undeterred by any threats[2] or calumnies, that we shall strive to our very utmost to refute as opposed to truth."

In answer to the claim that the emperor made, that he had done great honour to the Pope in writing to him,—a thing which his predecessors had not condescended to do since the sixth General Council—Nicholas pointed out that that was the emperor's loss. They had been in the midst of heresy, and had not come to the Apostolic See for the remedy against it. They had not written to Rome, because for the most part they had been heretics. How-

[1] Roy, p. 18.

[2] Later on in the course of this letter, the nobility of which is only equalled by its length, Nicholas again returns to the emperor's threats, and derisively asks what the emperor can do to a man more than a "poisonous fungus can." "O imperator in hoccine redacta est malitia hominis in iniquitate potentis, ut fungo malo comparetur." *Ib.*

ever, as a matter of fact, those who were not heretics, such as Constantine and Irene, had sought the help of the popes. Unlike your predecessors, Honorius, Valentinian, Marcian, Justinian, Constantine, and Irene, who were content to ask and petition the Roman See, you must give it *your orders*, "as though you were the heir not of their clemency and respect, but merely of their imperial power."

That the emperor should abuse the Latin language was certainly extraordinary, seeing that he called himself "emperor of the Romans," whose language was Latin.

Nicholas again declares at length that Ignatius has been wrongly condemned, and in a way utterly opposed to the canons, and even to the civil laws of Justinian, and warns the emperor not to attack the privileges of the Holy See over all the other churches,[1] lest they should fall upon him. "These privileges, by the words of Christ, founded on Blessed Peter, ever reverenced in the Church, cannot be lessened or changed; for human efforts cannot move the foundation which God has laid. . . . The privileges of this See existed before your empire, they will remain after you,[2] and they will remain inviolate as long as Christianity shall be preached. These privileges were given to this Holy See by Christ, not by councils; by councils they have only been proclaimed and reverenced. . . . Neither the Council of Nice nor any other council conferred any privileges on the Roman Church, which knew that in Peter it had merited to the full the rights of complete power, had received the government of all the sheep of Christ.[3] This is what the

[1] "Si . . . . contra privilegia Ecc. Rom. nisus vestros erigitis, cavete ne super vos convertantur." *Ib.*

[2] To-day they have remained some four centuries and a half after the final destruction of the whole Eastern empire.

[3] We shall surely be pardoned for giving this magnificent extract (as pointed to-day, a thousand years after it was penned, as it was then) at some length. "Ecclesiæ R. privilegia, Christi ore in b. Petro

blessed bishop Boniface (I.) attests [1] when writing to all the bishops of Thessaly: 'The universal institution of the new-born church had its source in the honour accorded to Blessed Peter, who received its direction and the sovereign power.'"

He could not think of yielding up to the emperor those who had fled to Rome from the East. Even barbarians would not be so false to the laws of hospitality. Besides, he has the right to summon to Rome "not only monks,[2] but any cleric whatsover from any diocese," whenever there was any need for the good of the Church. Moreover, they have not told him anything which he did not know from 'countless persons' who have come to Rome from Alexandria, Jerusalem, Constantinople and its neighbourhood, from Mount Olympus and other parts, and, indeed, from the emperor's own envoys and letters.

Instead of threatening Christians with the might of his arms, he should rather turn them against the Saracens for the recovery of Sicily and the other provinces they had seized.

However, to prevent things going from bad to worse, he will consent—"by an indulgence and not as furnishing a precedent for the future"—that the 'cause' of Ignatius and

firmata, in Ecclesia ipsa disposita, antiquitus observata, et a sanctis universalibus synodis celebrata, atque a cuncta ecclesia jugiter venerata, nullatenus possint minui, ... quoniam fundamentum quod Deus posuit, humanus non valet amovere conatus. . . . Privilegia istius sedis vel ecclesiæ perpetua sunt. . . . Quæ ante imperium vestrum fuerunt, et permanent, Deo gratias, hactenus illibata, manebuntque post vos, et quousque Christianum nomen prædicatum fuerit, illa subsistere non cessabunt immutilata. Ista privilegia huic S. Ecclesiæ a Christo donata, a synodis non donata, sed jam solummodo celebrata et veneranda." *Ib.*, Ep. 86.

[1] *Cf.* Jaffé, 364, 5 (147, 8).

[2] "Potestatem et jus habe(a)mus, non solum monachos, verum etiam quoslibet clericos de quacunque diœcesi, cum necesse fuerit ad nos convocare." *Ib.*

Photius should be re-opened at Rome. They were to come to Rome in person or by their deputies. Those who were to represent Ignatius were specially mentioned by the Pope, that he might be sure of having his case fully and truthfully stated. He wishes the authentic acts of the proceedings against Ignatius to be sent to him. What has moved him against the party of Gregory of Syracuse is no personal enmity, but "zeal for God's house and for the traditions of our ancestors, ecclesiastical order, ancient custom, and our solicitude for all the churches of God, as well as the privileges of our See, which, received by Blessed Peter from God, and handed on to the Roman Church, are acknowledged and venerated by the Universal Church." He would have Michael remember how execrated is the memory of Nero, of Diocletian, and the other persecutors of the Church, and how glorious the honour in which are held Constantine the Great, Theodosius the Great, and the others. Remember, he continues, how the latter respected the Apostolic See, the privileges they bestowed upon it, and the gifts with which they enriched it. Remember how they issued decrees that its faith had to be followed. But while they assembled councils, they did not dictate to them.

In conclusion he exhorts the emperor not to interfere in ecclesiastical concerns. For "every earthly ruler must keep himself as free from interfering in sacred matters as every soldier of Christ from temporal business. . . . For as Theodosius the Younger wrote to the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus. . . . It is not right for one who is not a bishop to meddle in ecclesiastical affairs." It was for the emperor to learn from the Pope the way of salvation; for the Pope to receive support from the emperor. Whoever tampers in any way with the Pope's letter is excommunicated.

Murder of Bardas, 866.

Though this weighty appeal produced no effect, it might have been supposed that the death of Bardas (April 29, 866), who was slain by the orders of Michael, now suspicious of his former favourite, would have made the course of the Pope's policy towards Photius easier. It, however, had no such effect. Michael associated with himself in the empire (May 26, 866) Basil the Macedonian, who had formerly been his groom. The new Cesar was anointed by Photius (Pentecost, 866).

Nine fresh letters to the East, 866.

Finding that the letter, the contents of which have just been cited, produced no effect, Nicholas made another effort, in the course of the same year, to put an end to the sorry state of affairs in the Church of Constantinople. Legates, whom he had received from the Bulgarians on the subject of the conversion of their people to Christianity (of which we shall treat later), were returning to their own country. To them Nicholas joined envoys[1] of his own, whom he furnished with no less than nine[2] letters for different personages in the East, and all dated November 13, 866. In the letter to the emperor, Nicholas repeats the history of Photius's affair, showing in detail how his first letter to Michael had been falsified. "You say,[3] O Emperor, that even without our consent Photius will keep his church, and will remain in communion with the Church, and that, on the other hand, Ignatius will not be in the least benefited by us. . . . But we believe that a member which cleaves to parts that adhere not to the

[1] Donatus, bishop of Ostia; Leo, a priest; and Marinus, a deacon, and afterwards Pope. *Cf.* the first and last of the nine letters mentioned in the text, viz., 98 and 106, ap. Migne, and the *L. P.*, n. lxx.

[2] Epp. 98, 99, 100–106, ap. Migne, addressed respectively to Michael, Photius, Bardas (with whose death months before Nicholas was unacquainted), Ignatius, the empress mother Theodora; Eudoxia, the wife of Michael, the clergy of Constantinople, the senators of Constantinople, and to the patriarchs and bishops of the Eastern world.

[3] Ep. 98.

head, will not long remain in sound condition." And, full of faith, he goes on to say that he thinks nothing of delay that may take place in the fulfilling of the punishments decreed by the Apostolic See. "It is his indeed to run (Rom. ix. 16), but it rests with God when it shall please Him to bring matters to an issue. . . . Those who have been once struck by the prelates of the Apostolic See, are to this very day so bound by their sentence that while, in many instances, the darts of judgment launched against them have not immediately wounded such of them as have been shielded by princes, they have in others, however, penetrated to the marrow of the bone, and have rendered some hateful to all, even after death." Instead of quoting the examples which Nicholas brings forward to exemplify the truth of his assertions, we will content ourselves with noting—what Nicholas himself did not live to see—that Ignatius died in possession of his See, and that, on the contrary, Photius died in exile, and Michael himself was murdered by Basil the Macedonian. He begs the emperor to reinstate Ignatius, and to cause the opprobrious letter[1] he wrote to him the year before to be burnt. Otherwise it and the other similar letters will have to be burnt in presence of a synod of all the Western provinces, an extremity to which Nicholas trusts the emperor will not drive him. In conclusion he is exhorted by all that is sacred, by the terrors of the last judgment, to do what is right by taking the proper steps for restoring Ignatius to his See.

In the other letters Photius is threatened with excommunication to the hour of his death; Ignatius and Theodora are consoled; Bardas (of whose death the Pope

[1] *Ib.*, the letter written "per indictionem tertiam deciman" (*i.e.* towards the end of 865), and written with a pen that had been dipped 'in snake's poison.'

was ignorant), Eudoxia, and the senators of Constantinople, exhorted to take the part of Ignatius, and the clergy of Constantinople and all "the patriarchs, metropolitans and other bishops, along with all the faithful throughout Asia and Libya, who with us defend the true doctrine," are fully informed of all that has been done in the affair of Photius.

The envoys of the Pope cannot reach Constantinople.

But when the papal legates, to whom these letters had been entrusted, reached the frontiers of the empire on the side of Bulgaria, they were met by an imperial official who insisted upon their signing a declaration of faith in which many so-called 'errors' of the Latins were set forth. On their refusing to comply, they were not only not allowed to proceed towards Constantinople, but were driven away with taunts and insults, the emperor himself even going so far as to declare that, if they had not come through Bulgaria, they should never, as long as they lived, have seen either him or Rome.[1]

Encyclical of Photius.

Furious because the Bulgarians had turned away from him and the Greeks, and had sent to Pope Nicholas for further instruction in the truths of Christianity, Photius sent a letter to the Bulgarian king full of charges, most of them trivial, against the Latins. This letter the king gave[2] to the papal envoys, and with it they returned to Rome. The pseudo-patriarch did not stop there. He raised the standard of rebellion against the supremacy of the Pope. He would confine the papal authority to the West, and himself be Pope in the East. He opened the campaign by an encyclical letter[3] which he sent to the Oriental bishops,

[1] The account of this in Anast., *in vit. Nich.*, n. lxxi. f., is corroborated by the notice of all this affair which we shall soon see Nicholas sending to Hincmar (867)—Ep. 152, ap. Migne.

[2] *Ib.*, Ep. 152. "Quam (epistolam imperatorum) ille accipiens nobis per legatos nostros deferri devota mente decrevit." The letter purported to come from the emperors Michael and Basil.

[3] The second letter of the first London ed., or ap. *P. G.*, t. cii. p. 722 f.

and in which he denounced the 'errors' of the Latins and their usurpations in Bulgaria. The letter begins: "Photius, by the mercy of God, archbishop of Constantinople, the New Rome, and œcumenical patriarch." After telling of the conversion of the Bulgarians, he says that his joy thereat is turned into tears. 'Wild beasts' have come from the West and ravaged the Lord's vineyard in Bulgaria, teaching their errors therein. They have taught the Bulgarians to fast on Saturdays, and to drink milk and eat cheese, etc., during the first week of Lent, which holy season they thus abridge. They profess to look down on married priests, and have even 'reconfirmed' those who have been anointed with the chrism by our priests, on the plea that to confirm belonged to bishops. What is worse, they have perverted the Creed, have added to it the words 'Filioque,' and thus introduced 'two principles' or causes into the Trinity. Instead of saying that the Holy Spirit comes "from the Father alone," they make out that the "Father is the cause of the Son and the Spirit, and that the cause of the Spirit is the Son."[1] In conclusion, he informs the Oriental bishops that a letter (that of Gunther), full of complaints against Nicholas, has reached him from the West. He sends them a copy of this letter, and calls on them to meet in synod to legislate on what he has laid before them.

In August 867 Photius held a synod in the presence of

Mock synod of Constantinople, 867.

[1] In his letter to the Bulgarians, in which Photius complains of their having turned to the Latins, he trumped up further accusations against them, viz., that they made the chrism for confirmation out of river-water; that at Easter, like the Jews, they offered up in sacrifice a lamb, in addition to the Lord's Body; that their clergy shaved; and that deacons were sometimes made bishops before they had been ordained priests. Finally, he asserted that with the kingly power the privileges of the Church of Old Rome were transferred to New Rome—"cum dignitatibus regiis etiam ecclesiæ Romanæ privilegia translata fuisse." This we learn from the letter of Nicholas, on the doings of Photius, to Hincmar. Ep. 152, *P. L.*, p. 1152.

the emperor Michael, and excommunicated Nicholas. The acts of this synod, the signatures to it especially, were so falsified by Photius, that some moderns, *e.g.* Jager, think that no synod was held at all. However, a synod of a sort does really seem to have been held; but, according to Anastasius,[1] out of the thousand signatures affixed to its acts, only twenty-one were genuine, as most of the assembly protested that it was not right for any one to pass sentence on the supreme pontiff (*in summum et primum pontificem*), much less for an inferior. Under Pope Hadrian II.,[2] the envoy of the emperor Basil declared at Rome that the signature of Michael had been obtained when he was drunk, and that the great mass of the subscriptions were forgeries.

Forged acts sent to the emperor Louis II. and his wife.

To effect his further ends, Photius caused Louis II. and his wife Ingelberga to be acclaimed with the imperial[3] title—whereas but seldom was this title ever conceded in the East to the Western emperors. The acts of his synod were then sent to them; and by flattery and rich presents he endeavoured to induce Ingelberga to move her husband to drive Nicholas from Rome.[4]

[1] *Præfat. in synod. VIII.* Anast. (*ib.*) expressly says, "Conciliabulum, præsidente Michæle, colligit. . . . Mendacem codicem compilat." *Cf.* Nicetas (Labbe, p. 1223). Metrophanes (*ib.*, p. 1387) says, "œcumenicam synodum confinxit (ἀνέπλασε) . . . . confictis omnium subscriptionibus."

[2] *Cf.* his *life*, ap. *L. P.* When Photius was disgraced by the emperor Basil, and his papers were seized, along with a copy of the above-mentioned conciliabule against Nicholas, a copy of the acts of a pretended synod against Ignatius was also discovered, which shows that the pseudo-patriarch did not stop at any forgery. *Cf.* Nicetas, p. 1226 f. Among the documents burnt in the eighth session of the eighth General Council were "libri qui ficte conscripti sunt contra S. Nicolaum, et gestorum relationes, ac synodos quæ contra S. Ignatium factæ sunt a Photio" (Labbe, p. 1101).

[3] Metroph.: "Imperatorem Ludovicum et Ingelbergam in conficta synodo acclamavit Augustam." *L. c.*

[4] *Ib.*

But the envoys of Photius never reached Italy. For the time their master's power for evil was over. The emperor Basil, seeing "that it is my life or yours," caused Michael to be murdered (September 24, 867), sent Photius into exile,[1] and recalled his envoys. Ignatius was reinstated (November 26), and word of these events at once sent to Rome. And though Nicholas, to whom much of this news must have been most welcome, had died (November 13, 867) before the emperor's messenger reached him, he seems before his end to have become acquainted with some of it by more or less well-founded reports.[2] Fall of Photius, 867.

He had not, however, been inactive after the receipt of the letter which Photius had sent to the Bulgarians. He resolved that the voice of the West should make itself heard in proclaiming the true doctrine of the Church, especially on the "Procession of the Holy Ghost." Accordingly he wrote (October 23, 867) a long letter, setting forth the conduct of Photius, to Hincmar, with whom he had had many a passage of arms, but whom he could not fail to admire for his energy, courage, and learning. He points out that in their attack against the 'stainless'[3] Roman Church, the Greeks are attacking the whole West, and, after enumerating the charges brought by Photius against "that part where the Latin tongue is used," he exhorts Hincmar and the other metropolitans to call together their suffragans, to deliberate over the best answer to be made against the detractions of the Greeks, and to let him know the result of their deliberations at once. "There is nothing so much feared by our enemies, whether visible or invisible, as concord. . . . Let us march against our common foes like an army in battle array." The 'animus' of the Greek Nicholas stirs up the West against Photius.

[1] *L. P.*, etc. [3] "Sicut fama se habuit." *L. P.*, n. lxxvi.

[2] Ep. 152. "Romana ecclesia non habente maculam, aut rugam, aut aliquid hujusmodi."

rulers and their satellites, he continues, may be seen in this, that what they allege against us is either false, or has been acknowledged to be our right, not only by the West, "but even[1] by the great doctors of the Church who once flourished among them (the Greeks)." He asks them to consider whether these attacks on the Roman Church are to be tolerated. "Never has there been any Church, let alone that of Constantinople, which was instituted long after (the other great Sees), the teaching or authority of which the Roman Church has ever followed. On the contrary, the Roman Church has rather instituted the other churches. . . . That we are[2] sinners indeed we deny not, but that we have ever been stained with the slighest error, we cannot in the least allow; whereas they (the Greeks) are never free from schism or error."

Works against the Greeks.

This dignified letter, which we could wish to have cited in its entirety, was written[3] by Nicholas when he was "sick unto death." But it produced its effect. Hincmar acted[4] with his accustomed promptness, and works against the errors and calumnies of the Greeks came from the pens of Odo of Beauvais, Æneas of Paris, and Ratram, a monk of Corbie.

Æneas carried the war into the enemy's country, and in the Preface[5] to his work made a vigorous use of the *argu-*

[1] *Ib.* "Et cum floruerint etiam apud ipsos magni doctores Ecclesiæ."

[2] This passage is deserving of the careful consideration of those who profess to believe that Catholics teach that the popes are 'impeccable,' instead of being under certain circumstances 'infallible.' "Nam licet nos peccatores quidem esse non denegemus, quorumlibet tamen errorum fæce pollutos, Deo gratias, minime recognoscimus." *Ib.* Nicholas also wrote to the bishops of Germany on this subject. *Cf. Annal. Fuld.*, ad an. 868.

[3] *Annal. Hinc.*, ad an. 867.

[4] *Cf.* Flodoard, *Hist. Rem.*, iii. 1; Ep. Hinc. No. 14, ap. *P. L.*, t. 126.

[5] Ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi. 171 ff. Among the points raised by the Greeks to condemn the Latins, he mentions the shaving of their beards by the Western clergy, the making of the chrism from river water (!), etc.

mentum ad hominem. After quoting numerous examples to prove his point, he urged: "It is a most lamentable truth that that very See which is now attempting to raise its head to the skies has, in place of bishops of the true faith, had heretical rulers stained with false doctrine. But by the guidance of God such a disgrace has never befallen the Roman See that an heresiarch should sit in the place which the Prince of the Apostles has adorned by his presence and consecrated by his blood, and to which with special care the Son of God has entrusted His sheep to be ruled. For to it was it said, "Thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my church, etc. (S. Matt. xvi. 18). Can He not strengthen the faith of the one to whom by His own authority He gave His kingdom?—the one whom, in saluting as a rock, He marked out as the foundation of His Church."

In the body of his work[1] he replies in detail to the objections raised by Photius against the Latins, which he stigmatises justly for the most part, as trifling or altogether inane.

But the most important production on this matter was that of Ratram,[2] who opens his treatise (i. c. 2) by expressing his disapproval of secular princes mixing themselves up in religious matters, asking them why they now object to what their predecessors have always respected, and reminding them that there are no new doctrines in the Church of Rome, but that its doctrine and discipline are those which have been handed down to it by the ancients, who had in turn received them from the apostles.

Here we may conveniently, for the present, part company with Photius, and turn our attention to that important affair in the West—the divorce of King Lothaire

[1] Ap. *P. L.*, t. 121.

[2] He wrote in four books, *Contra Græcos*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 121.

—out of which Photius endeavoured to make capital for himself.

Lothaire wishes to repudiate his wife.

In 856 Lothaire, king of Lorraine, married Theutberga, the daughter of Boso, count of Burgundy, and sister of that disorderly cleric Hubert, of whom we have already written. But the young licentious monarch soon wearied of her, and wished to marry Waldrada, with whom he had long had illicit intercourse. To cover his design with some show of love of justice, he called together, in 858 or 859, the bishops and nobles of his kingdom, and accused his wife of incest with her brother before her marriage. The queen indignantly denied the crime. Her champion went through the ordeal of 'boiling water' with success, and she was declared innocent.[1] Lothaire, however, now began to ill-treat the unfortunate woman.[2] When her spirit had been sufficiently broken, and he had gained over to his views Gunther, archbishop of Cologne, Theutgard, archbishop of Trier, and others,[3] two synods were held one after the other at Aix-la-Chapelle in the early months of 860, in which Theutberga was made to declare that her brother had violated her. She was condemned to a convent, and Lothaire told no longer to regard her as his wife.[4] Theutberga, however, managed to escape to her brother, secured the interest of Charles the Bald, and appealed to the Pope.[5]

[1] *Cf.* Hincmar, *Lib. de divortio Loth.*, thought (Jungmann, iii. 237) to have been written in the year 860. In another part of the same treatise, Hincmar lays down the principles that kings, like everybody else, are subject to the laws of the Church, and that an appeal lies to the Holy See from councils, whether provincial or general: "Apostolica sedes et comprovincialium et generalium (synodorum), retractet, refricet vel confirmet judicia." *Resp. ad quæst.*, ii., ap. *P. L.*, t. 125.

[2] *Annal. Prudent.*, ad an. 858.

[3] Regino, *in Chron.*, ad an. 864.

[4] Hincmar, *ib.*; *Annal. Prudent.*, ad an. 860; and the letter of those present at the two synods to Nicholas (Labbe, viii. 697).

[5] *Annal. Prudent.*, *ib.*; *Annal. Xantenses*, ad an. 861; Epp. Nic., 21. "Multis vicibus sedem apostolicam lacrymosis litteris studuit appellare."

Of the two archbishops here mentioned for the first time, Regino, who is followed by the so-called *Annalista Saxo* (ad. an. 864), asserts that Lothaire gained over Gunther, whom this author describes as wanting in stability of character, by promising to marry his niece, and that Gunther in turn won over Theutgard, who is set down as a simple and unlearned man, by perverting for him Scripture and Canon Law. We learn, however, still on the authority of Regino and the *Annalista*, that Gunther was deservedly punished. No sooner had Lothaire got his divorce sanctioned by him, than, as report went, he sent for the niece, but soon, after having dishonoured her, drove her home with insult. But our *Annalista* did not write till the twelfth century, and Regino was not strictly a contemporary. Hence, considering the way that Gunther stood to the cause of Lothaire, he can scarcely have been so wantonly disgraced by his sovereign.

Meanwhile both Lothaire himself and his bishops wrote (an. 860–1) to Nicholas, saying that they were only waiting for a favourable opportunity to go to him, as they knew that when any important affair arose in the Church, recourse must be had to the Pope, and begging him not to give heed to any calumnious reports till their envoys should arrive in Rome.[1]

Gets leave to marry Waldrada, 862.

To complete his schemes Lothaire assembled a third council at Aix-la-Chapelle in April 862. He declared before the bishops that in accordance with their decrees he had given up all intercourse with the incestuous Theutberga, but plainly told them that from long[2] habit of indulgence he could not keep continent, but preferred

[1] Epp. 1 and 2 among the *Epp. ad divortium Loth. II. pertinent.*, recently published in *M. G. Epp.*, vi.

[2] *Cf.* the acts of the council, *e.g.* ap. Labbe, viii. 739s. "Ab infantia seu pueritia inter feminas conversatus."

legitimate to illegitimate gratifications. The upshot of the deliberations of the bishops on this appeal, as hypocritical in some parts as bluntly frank in others, was that the majority of them, after perverting Scripture and tradition, decided that Lothaire might marry again. He accordingly espoused Waldrada, December 25, 862.

He also had in the meantime sent to Rome to ask that legates might be sent to examine into the rights of his case, and to assure the Pope that his father, the emperor Lothaire, had originally given him Waldrada as his wife, but that he had afterwards been compelled to take Theutberga.[1] For some little time Nicholas was unable to attend to the requests of Theutberga and Lothaire. But at length, in November (862), he despatched two legates, Rodoald of Porto (the full extent of whose defection at Constantinople the Pope did not then know), and John of Ficolo, now Cervia, near Ravenna. To them he entrusted various letters[2] to Lothaire, Charles the Bald, and others, ordering a synod to assemble at Metz, and that bishops from the kingdoms of Charles the Bald, Louis the German, and Charles of Provence should assist at it. In his letter to the bishops who were to take part in the council, Nicholas ordered them to send its acts to him, that he might approve or order them to be reconsidered, as the case might be.

Charles the Bald had already begun to exert himself to give effect to such letters of Nicholas as had before this been despatched to Lothaire on the subject of the divorce. In the document presented (November 3, 862) to his brother Louis the German, at the assembly at Savonnière, Charles, whilst declaring that he is not acting from any

[1] With the first letter of Nicholas to Lothaire (Ep. 17), compare his instructions (*commonitorium*) to his legates, ap. Labbe viii. 481, and Ep. 145, ap. *P. L.*, t. 119, p. 1165.

[2] Dated November 23, 862; Epp. 17–21; *L. P.*, n. xlvi.

motives of making political capital, that he seeks not Lothaire's kingdom, but Lothaire himself, urges that the matter is of importance to all Christians, that kings who ought to set a good example to all must beware of giving a bad one, and that Lothaire must put an end to the scandal which is being spread through all Christendom. The Pope's injunctions, "in no way opposed to the teaching of the Gospel or the authority of the apostles and the canons," must be carried out. And Louis is reminded that "that holy and first See in all the world cries out to them and to all Christians, 'with such a one not so much as to eat'"[1] (1 Cor. v. 11).

These efforts of Charles the Bald, if ever so well meant, came to nothing. Receiving countenance from Louis, the adulterous monarch felt himself in a position to despise the admonitions of his uncle Charles. Throughout the whole of this tedious affair, political motives entered largely into the support or opposition meted out to the king of Lorraine.

The council of Metz, 863.

Partly through the intrigues of Lothaire and partly through an incursion of the Northmen, the holding of the synod ordered by the Pope was deferred. Then there came more letters from Nicholas,[2] and the synod met at the place appointed (Metz) in June 863. But Lothaire had bought[3] the legates, and by arrangement no bishops were present except those of the king's own country. To such an assembly Lothaire's wishes were law; his divorce was approved, and Gunther and Theutgard were com-

[1] *Capit.*, 243, ap. Boretius, ii. p. 159 f. "Illa etiam sancta et prima in toto orbe terrarum sedes per divinum Paulum," etc.

[2] Labbe, viii. 481.

[3] *Cf.* Anast., *in vit.*; Hincmar, *Annal.*, ad an. 863. "Missi (pontificis) corrupti muneribus, epistolas domni apostolici occultantes, nihil de his quae sibi commendata fuerunt, secundum sacram auctoritatem egerunt." *Annal. Fuld.*, ad an. 863; Nich., Epp. 56, 154.

missioned, in deference to the orders of Nicholas,[1] to convey the results of the deliberations of the synod to the Pope.

The iniquitous decision of the council was at once universally denounced, and word of it conveyed to Nicholas by pilgrims and by letters.[2] Nicholas was, however, unwilling to credit mere report. Rodoald had the wit not to await the searching examination of Nicholas. He fled. Gunther and Theutgard, however, either trusting to their own acumen[3] to deceive Nicholas, or relying on might rather than right, boldly faced the Pope and a Roman Council (October 863) in the Lateran palace.

Council at Rome, 863.

Their acumen, at any rate, counted for nothing when Nicholas was in question. He laughed at it as at "a mousetrap[4] set for the unwary." As was his wont, he called together a synod. It was held in the Lateran palace. A little examination of the memoir of the council which they had brought with them was enough to convict them. The decision of the synod of Metz was annulled, the two archbishops deposed, and a like fate was decreed against the other bishops of the council unless they submitted at once to the decision of the Holy See.[5] Of his decision Nicholas at once informed Lothaire, and asked him if he did not deserve to be punished also, inasmuch as, set to guide

[1] So say the *Annal. Xanten.*, a very likely authority, as composed at the time in Gunther's diocese.

[2] Nich., Ep. 56.

[3] They procured the aid of Hagano, bishop of Bergamo ("versutus et cupidissimus"—Hincmar, *ib.*), and of the rebellious John, archbishop of Ravenna. They were both condemned by the council of October 863.

[4] Ep., *ib.*

[5] *Cf. Annal. Hincmar* and *Fuld.*, ad an. 863; *Xant.*, ad an. 864; Anast., *in vit.*; Nich., Ep. 154. Regino (ad an. 865) brands as fools these archbishops who tried to deceive the See that cannot be deceived! "Stultitiæ eulogio denotandi, qui illam Petri sedem aliquo pravo dogmate fallere posse arbitrati sunt, quæ nec fefellit, nec ab aliqua hæresi unquam falli potuit."

his people, he was leading them to ruin by his bad example.[1]

The archbishops appeal to the emperor, 864.

But Gunther and his supporters had no intention of submitting to the spiritual authority of the Pope. They went to seek what seemed to them the more tangible might of the civil power. They turned to their king's brother, the emperor Louis. They loudly proclaimed both in words and in writing that they had been unjustly deposed, they spread abroad all kinds of calumnies against the Pope, and they drew up a document, under seven heads, which evinced, at least to their own satisfaction, the justice of their cause on the one hand and the tyranny of the Pope on the other. This they sent to the bishops of their own country, to Photius, and even to the Pope himself; and, finally, by judiciously exalting the emperor's pretensions, they secured his armed support. To Louis they urged that it was outrageous that proceedings should be taken against ambassadors of kings and emperors, and that metropolitans could not be condemned without the cognisance of their prince.[2] In their manifesto, which Hincmar speaks[3] of as 'diabolical,' they spoke of "Nicholas, who is called the Pope . . . . and makes himself the emperor of the whole world."[4] They wanted the bishops of his kingdom to give every encouragement to their common lord, Lothaire. They pre-

[1] *Cf.* fragments of letters to Lothaire (Migne, Epp. 57, 58) and Anast., *in vit.*

[2] "Nunquam auditum . . . . quod ullus metropolitanus sine conscientia principis . . . . fuerit degradatus" (Regino, *in Chron.*, ad an. 865). *Cf.* Hincmar, *Annal.*, ad an. 864; Nich., Ep. 65; *Annales Xant.*, ad an. 865. The contemporary author of the last-named annals remarks that, when the archbishops asserted that their rank was nowise inferior to that of the Pope, they forgot they had received the pallium from him.

[3] Hinc., *ib.* "Diabolica capitula et hactenus inaudita.'

[4] *Ib.* "Domnus Nicolaus qui dicitur papa . . . . totiusque mundi imperatorem se facit." The document, without the preface, also appears in the *Annals of Fulda*, ad an. 863.

tended that they had come humbly to ask the Pope's decision on what they had done, but that Nicholas, after keeping them long waiting, had 'arbitrarily and tyrannically' condemned them. Nicholas and his sentence they alike despised.

The emperor Louis comes to Rome, Feb. 864.

With the two archbishops in his train, Louis advanced on Rome "to make the Pope restore them or pay the penalty."[1] Nicholas prepared for his coming by ordering fasts and prayers to beg the Almighty to move the emperor "to reverence the authority of the Apostolic See." On the arrival of the emperor at Rome, violence became the 'order' of the day.

According to Wido, a cleric of Osnabruck, who at the close of the eleventh century wrote a pamphlet against S. Gregory VII., Louis kept the Pope and his clergy besieged in St. Peter's, and greatly oppressed by want of food and by cold for fifty-two days. As his authority for all this, Wido quotes a work "De querimonia Romanorum,"[2] of which, unfortunately, nothing else is known. Confining ourselves, however, to the works of authors of whom something is known, we read that the emperor's troops violently dispersed a procession that was making its way to St. Peter's. In the tumult the magnificently adorned cross which contained the wood of the true cross, and which the empress Helen had sent to Rome, was broken and tossed into the mud. "Whence," adds the archiepiscopal annalist Hincmar, "it was picked up and restored to its custodians by some men, who are said to have been English."[3]

[1] *Ib.*

[2] *Cf.* a letter (dated 1118) of a cleric of Osnabruck, ap. Jaffé, *Mon. Bamberg.*, p. 340.

[3] With the narrative of Hincmar compare that of Erchempert (*Hist. Lang.*, c. 37), who assigns, as a cause of some of the misfortunes of Louis, his treatment of Nicholas (*vir Deo plenus*) on this occasion. "Vicariumque B. Petri," adds the monks "quasi vile mancipium ab officio sui

The speedy death of the man who had broken the cross, however, and the fact of the emperor's being seized with a fever,[1] changed the aspect of affairs. Through the mediation of the empress, Louis and the Pope were reconciled. Louis withdrew his troops, who had inflicted[2] the gravest injuries on men, women, and things, and ordered the degraded archbishops to return to their own country. The bishops of Lorraine, moreover, submitted to the sentence of the Pope,[3] as did also Theutgard.

Obstinacy of Gunthe

Gunther, however, took not the slightest notice of the Pope's sentence, and did not hesitate to say Mass on Maundy Thursday. But, not choosing to have his cause utterly compromised by being connected with a deposed and rebellious archbishop, Lothaire himself abandoned Gunther,[4] who, according to the annals, known as *Xantenses*,[5] was excommunicated by all the bishops of the kingdom of Lothaire. Enraged at this treatment, Gunther, after seizing, to gratify his avarice,[6] all that was left of the treasure of his Church, betook himself to Rome "to lay bare before the Pope all the deceits which had been practised by Lothaire and himself in the affair of Theutberga."[7]

ministerii, nisi Dominus restitisset, privare voluit." *Cf.* also the account of this transaction in the *Libellus de Imp. potest.* The anonymous partisan of the emperor contrives to throw most of the blame on the Pope and his side.

[1] Hincmar, *Annal.*, *ib.*

[2] *Ib.* "Sanctimonialium ceterarumque feminarum constuprationibus atque hominum cædibus, necnon et ecclesiarum infractionibus."

[3] *Ib.* *Cf.* also the letter of submission of Adventius of Metz (Labbe, viii. 482), and the replies of Nicholas to Franco of Tongres (Mæstricht) (Ep. 67) and to Adventius (Ep. 68).

[4] Ep. Lothar. ad Nicol., Labbe, viii. 499.

[5] Ad an. 865. [6] "Avariciæ facibus semper exarsit." *Ib.*

[7] Hincmar, *Annal.*, ad an. 864; *cf. A. Xant.*, *ib.* Gunther could only procure for himself restoration to lay communion. *Cf. An. Xant.*, ad an. 866; *An. Fuld.*, ad an. 864. See his letter begging Hincmar to intercede in his behalf for restoration to his See. Ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi. 242.

The legate Arsenius sent to Lothaire, 865.

In the early part of the following year (865) Lothaire received a joint intimation from Louis the German and Charles the Bald, to the effect that before he went to Rome, as he constantly talked of doing, he was to put an end to the scandal he had caused in the Church. Fearing that the division of his kingdom was what Louis and Charles had chiefly in mind, Lothaire found it necessary to turn to Nicholas for protection.[1] Thinking the moment favourable for bringing him to his duty, Nicholas wrote[2] to stir up to action the bishops of his kingdom, and sent to him Arsenius, bishop of Horta. He commended[3] his legate to the above-mentioned two kings, and assured them it was only that there might not be bloodshed that he had hitherto refrained from excommunicating Lothaire. At Gondreville, near Toul, on the Moselle, Arsenius met Lothaire and his bishops, and, in the Pope's name, declared that, unless he took back Theutberga, he would be excommunicated.

Lothaire takes back Theutberga.

Lothaire was now thoroughly alarmed. He and twelve of his nobles swore to recognise only Theutberga[4] as queen. After she had been publicly accepted as his consort by Lothaire, Arsenius set out for Rome. On his return he passed through Bavaria to collect the money that was due to the Holy See from patrimonies situated therein, having in his custody, to take before the Pope, Lothaire's mistress, Waldrada.

Excommunication of Waldrada, 866.

She, however, before they reached Rome, contrived to escape from the legate, and returned to where there might be easy communication between herself and her paramour. Indignant at this disgraceful relapse, Nicholas publicly

[1] Hincmar, ad an. 866. [2] Ep. 80.

[3] Ep. 83. "Vindictam in eum, ne sanguis effunderetur, et ne bella excitarentur, propalare distulimus."

[4] Hincmar, ad an. 865; *Fuld.*, ad an. 865; *Xant.*, ad an. 866.

excommunicated (February 2, 866) Waldrada, "and all her aiders and abettors."[1]

Meanwhile the unfortunate Theutberga had been subjected to the grossest indignities by her brutal husband, and at length, weary of the struggle, begged the Pope to annul her marriage, and let Lothaire have Waldrada as his legitimate wife. But Nicholas at once came to the poor woman's support. He assured her by letter[2] (January 24, 867) that, from what he had heard from all sources of her cruel treatment, he knew she would write to him in that strain. She must understand one thing, however, that even if she dies, he will not, by the mercy of God who will judge adulterers, leave Lothaire wholly unpunished if he ever takes back Waldrada. He exhorts her to be brave, and not to fear, especially in the cause of truth, to meet death, which she must necessarily one day encounter. Still he does not think that Lothaire would dare to plot against her life. She has the Apostolic See on her side.

Theutberga tries to get her marriage annulled.

Nicholas did not stop with this letter. He wrote[3] (January 25) to the bishops of Lothaire's kingdom to urge them to do their duty boldly in the matter of the excommunicated Waldrada; and to Charles the Bald,[4] that he could not believe that by the gift of a monastery he had been induced to side with Lothaire against Theutberga, and that he could not allow Theutberga's case to be again brought forward and submitted to the trial "by single combat." And he instructed Lothaire[5] himself to avoid the excommunicated Waldrada lest he himself be also excommunicated. A little later (March 7) he wrote[6] to Louis the German, to beg him to exhort Lothaire to bestow his love on Theutberga.

[1] *Ann. Fuld.*, ad an. 867, and Nich., Ep. 93, "cum universis complicibus et communicatoribusque suis."

[2] Ep. 146. [3] Ep. 147. [4] Ep. 148.

[5] Ep. 149. [6] Ep. 150.

Lothaire replied (867) in his usual style. He professed the most unbounded respect for the authority of the Pope, and the most ardent wish to present himself before "his most beloved paternity." But "various unfortunate circumstances had hitherto put obstacles in the way of his devotion." However, in the month of July he is to hold a diet, and by envoys from it will prove to the Pope that he will be as obedient to him as his ancestors have ever been. "But if anyone has told you that, since the departure of Arsenius, I have anywhere seen or held any converse with Waldrada after her return from Italy, he has said what is wholly untrue."[1] One knows not whether more to grieve at the sufferings of the unfortunate queen, loathe the hypocrisy of Lothaire, or wonder at the patience of Nicholas in dealing with him.

To within a fortnight of his death the unwearied Pope exerted himself for Theutberga. He wrote[2] to exhort the bishops of the kingdom of Louis the German to take up her cause; and to Louis[3] himself to explain that he would not allow Lothaire to come and personally plead his case at Rome until, in accordance with his orders, Waldrada was first sent there.

Hadrian II. and the divorce question.

The interminable negotiations concerning this divorce were only brought to an end in the reign of Hadrian II. by the death of Lothaire. Hadrian, who was consecrated (December 14, 867) a few days after the death of Nicholas,

[1] Ep. 17, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi. p. 238.

[2] Ep. 155. A long letter, and to the historian a useful one, as it goes over the whole question of the divorce. To counteract the various means to deceive that were resorted to by the different parties with whom Nicholas came in contact, and to prevent the truth regarding his conduct in a particular case from becoming overlaid, Nicholas adopted the plan of frequently reviewing at length all its circumstances. By that means he hoped that sooner or later the truth would be made clear. Ep. 155 is dated October 31, 867.

[3] Ep. 156, November 1, 867.

was a man of a most conciliatory disposition. As far as man could go without sacrifice of principle, that far, without any thought of what his own status in the eyes of men might lose, would Hadrian go. And yet he was so strictly wedded to the ideas of Nicholas, that by the opponents of that great Pope he was called a Nicholaïte.[1] He began his policy of concession by admitting to communion as priests[2]—but not as bishops—Theutgard of Trier, Zachary of Anagni, and the cardinal priest Anastasius, whom he soon appointed "librarian of the Roman Church."

Lothaire gets permission to come to Rome, 868.

Encouraged by this, Lothaire wrote to him lamenting the death of Nicholas as well as the fact that he had given heed rather to his (Lothaire's) enemies than to himself, and expressing his great desire to come to Rome.[3] Hadrian, in reply, bade him come to receive the blessing he asked, if he felt himself free from the charges urged against him, or suitable penance if he was guilty.[4] He would not, however, listen to Theutberga, who came to Rome to beg for the dissolution of her marriage, but threatened to excommunicate anyone who should molest her in the meanwhile, were it Lothaire himself.[5]

The excommunication of Waldrada is taken off, Feb. 868.

As a further step in his policy of conciliation, he removed the sentence of excommunication from Waldrada on the ground that he had learnt from many, and especially from the emperor Louis, that she was sorry for her previous conduct. She was not, however, to hold any intercourse whatever with Lothaire,[6] and was to strive so to live that

[1] *L. P., in vit. Had.*

[2] "Sub congrua satisfactione." *Ib.*

[3] Ep. 18, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi. 239. He even pretends the greatest joy that "the Bulgarians and other fierce barbarians have come to the threshold of the apostles."

[4] Ap. Regino, *in Chron.*, 868.

[5] Ep. Had. ad Loth., ap. Mansi, *Conc.*, xv. p. 833.

[6] "Data licentia præfati dumtaxat Regis (Lotharii) societati propter antiqui hostis versutias, nullo pacto penitus adhærendi." Ep. ad

the absolution he had given her might be ratified before God, who, unlike man, can see the heart.

Lothaire meets the Pope, 869.

Hoping to win Hadrian entirely over to his desires, Lothaire set out for Rome to have an interview with him, June 869. He gained the avaricious empress Ingelberga[1] with presents, and had the desired meeting with Hadrian at Monte Cassino. As what took place at that famous old abbey is often very sensationally stated by moderns, relying on their imaginations or on other than strictly contemporary authors, we will here give *verbatim* the account left us by Hincmar, our best authority, in his *Annals*. "Through the mediation of Ingelberga, Lothaire succeeded in obtaining that the Pope, to whom he had given many presents, should sing Mass in his presence, and should give him Holy Communion on the understanding that, since Waldrada's excommunication by Pope Nicholas, he had never dwelt with her, had criminal relations with her, or even a conversation with her. The unhappy man, like Judas, pretending a good conscience, did not hesitate boldly to receive Holy Communion. His supporters also received communion from the Pope, among whom was Gunther, the chief instigator of this public adultery. He received communion from Hadrian among the laity, after he had presented to him in public a declaration (of submission)."

The same annalist goes on to relate that Lothaire followed the Pope to Rome (July), but was not received nor lodged in state.

Death of Lothaire, 869.

However, before he left Rome he received a few small presents from the Pope, who had arranged[2] that a final

Waldr. *Cf.* Ep. ad Epp. Galliæ, etc., ap. Mansi, *ib.*, 834 *seq.*; Hincmar, *Annal.*, ad an. 868.

[1] *Annal.*, Hinc., ad an. 869.

[2] In a synod held in July, according to Lapôtre (*Revue des Quest. Hist.*, April 1880), who assigns to this synod and to Formosus of Porto

decision should be pronounced on his case in a synod to be held in Rome the following year (870). But Lothaire was seized with a fever before he left Italy, and, "not willing to perceive therein the judgment of God,"[1] he died (August 8, 869) at Piacenza along with most of his suite. Both Theutberga and Waldrada ended their days in convents.

In bringing the long history of this divorce question to a close, we may observe that the conduct of Nicholas and Hadrian throughout it has won the admiration of all schools of historians alike. One would be less than man not to admire it.

Nicholas and Hincmar of Rheims.

With Lothaire on the one hand and Photius on the other, Nicholas might seem to have had enough to keep his thoughts occupied. But not to speak of smaller matters, he had many other affairs of great moment on his mind at the same time. He had to bring to submission the imperious archbishop of Rheims, and to guide the first steps of the Bulgarians along the road of Christianity. Of his negotiations with Hincmar on the matter of Wulfad and his companions we have already spoken. It remains for us to treat of the differences between them on the subject of the deposition of Rothad.

His paramount respect for the Holy See was the only thing which prevented Hincmar, the greatest prelate in the

the anonymous speech, published by Muratori (*R. I. S.*, ii., pt. ii., p. 135), and more completely by Maassen. Lapôtre shows conclusively that the speech was certainly not made by the Pope, and points out, on the contrary, how vigorously its author opposes any reversion of the decisions of Nicholas.

[1] Hincmar, *Ann.*, *l. c.* *Cf. Ann. Lobienses*, 870, and *Chron.*, Ado., both ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii. Such is the history of the close of Lothaire's life—quite sensational enough—as related by Hincmar. Regino, who did not write his *Chronicle* till about 910, and the annals of Metz, which copy him, furnish other details which can scarcely be relied on. They are the ones given by Milman.

West after Nicholas himself, from bringing one or other of his disputes with the Pope to the extreme to which Photius had carried his difference with Rome; for, though good and learned, Hincmar could not brook opposition. He would go very far to have his own way.

Rothad of Soissons.

With one of his suffragans, Rothad of Soissons, Hincmar had for many years not been on very good terms.[1] He accuses Rothad of being "an unfruitful fig tree." This very vague accusation was taken up by Charles the Bald,[2] who afterwards favoured Hincmar in this matter. He had long, he says, been useless in the sacred ministry; and (here was the unpardonable offence) to his archbishop's written exhortations, had returned for sole answer that his metropolitan could do nothing but send him his booklets all day long! Descending to some detail, he further accuses Rothad of alienating at will the property of his Church. But it must be confessed that in his explanation of his conduct to the Pope (Ep. 2), Hincmar does not attend in a straightforward manner to the facts of the case in question. According to the statement in Rothad's apology, these were as follows. Rothad had "*regularly* deposed," or, as he explains in another part, had deposed "on the decision of thirty-three bishops," a priest taken in adultery.[3] After the lapse of three years Hincmar espoused the cause of this man, and, "without in the least informing" Rothad, he caused the priest (whom Rothad had put

[1] This is clear as well from the statement of his case which Rothad presented to the Pope, and which is printed in the *Councils* among the letters of Pope Nicholas, as from the account of the affair which, from his point of view, Hincmar sent to the Pope in 864. (Ep. 2, Hinc., ap. Migne, t. 126.) *Cf.* also the discourse of the Pope on this subject, ap. *P. L.*, t. 119, p. 890.

[2] Nic., Ep. 83.

[3] "Quia in stupro fuerat deprehensus et abscissus." *Libellus proclamationis* of Rothad, ap. Labbe, viii. 785. The last word gives us some insight into the violence of the times.

in the place of the one he had deposed) to be seized, excommunicated, and imprisoned; and reinstated the adulterer.[1] Such unreasonable, not to say uncanonical, conduct Rothad naturally resented. Thereupon, in a synod held outside Soissons (861), Hincmar declared Rothad deprived of episcopal communion till he should submit to his decision.[2]

Rothad appeals to Rome, 862.

But when, in the following year, Rothad was prohibited by Hincmar, "who lorded it over[3] the whole" gathering, from attending an assembly convoked by Charles the Bald, at Pistres, near Pont de l'Arche on the Seine, he appealed to the Holy See.[4] But before he could set out for Rome, Hincmar had obtained possession of one of his letters, in which, according to him, Rothad stated that he withdrew his appeal, and asked that his case might be tried again before certain selected judges (*judices electi*). It was really one of a series of letters which he had written preparatory to his departure. In it he had exhorted some of his colleagues to continue to sustain his cause as they had done at Pistres. The archbishop then made haste to call a second synod together in the neighbourhood of Soissons, and summoned Rothad to appear before it. He, however, persisted in his appeal. "To the supreme authority of the Holy See I appeal unceasingly—to that See, the authority of which no one can gainsay, to that See which through Blessed Peter has merited such power (*principatum*) from Our Lord Jesus Christ. I await the decision of that See to which I have appealed, nor do I consent to be judged elsewhere than at Rome. It is preposterous that the inferior

[1] "Illumque depositum genitalibus truncatum in meæ parœciæ ecclesia restituit." (*Ib.*, p. 788.)

[2] Hincmar, *Annal.*, 861.

[3] "Quasi omnium dominus præsidens et prævalens," says Rothad (*Libell. proc.*). *Cf.* Hincmar, *Annal.*, 862.

[4] *L. P.*, II. lviii.

should be preferred before the superior."[1] Rothad was, nevertheless, declared by the synod contumacious, and deposed. He was then imprisoned, and another bishop ordained in his place.[2] Concerning this decision Nicholas afterwards (Christmas Eve, 864)[3] said that if Rothad "had never appealed, he ought not to have been deposed without his knowledge, inasmuch as the sacred canons and the venerable decrees of bishops have decided that the causes of bishops—as affairs of greater importance (*majora negotia*)—were to be left to the judgment of the Apostolic See."

Negotiations with Rome, 863.

As soon as Nicholas had been informed of what had happened with regard to Rothad, unofficially at first, and soon after by the formal account of the synod of Soissons, he took up the affair with his usual vigour. Six letters[4] were despatched in the month of April to Charles the Bald, to Hincmar, to the bishops of the synod of Soissons, and to Rothad. To Hincmar, Nicholas expresses his indignation at the cruel treatment that had been meted out to Rothad in his old age, and gives the archbishop plainly to understand that, within thirty days after the receipt of his letter, he must either restore Rothad to his former dignity, or come to Rome in person or by deputy, in order that the matter may be there thoroughly investigated. If the Pope's orders are not complied with, Hincmar has no longer permission to offer the Holy Sacrifice—a punishment which he must inform the other bishops, who acted with him, will also fall on them if they show themselves

[1] "Ad illam summam auctoritatem sine intermissione appello, cui nullus potest contradicere, quæ a D. J. C. per b. Petrum tantum meruit principatum. Judicium ergo illius ad quam proclamavi expeto," etc. Rothad, *Libell. proc.*

[2] *Libellus.*

[3] The *discourse* mentioned in a preceding note.

[4] Epp. 33–38.

disobedient.[1] The bishops themselves are blamed for trying to show from the *civil* law that Rothad had no right of appeal, when by the *canon* law they knew that he had. They are commanded "by apostolical and canonical authority" to send Rothad to Rome under the penalty above rehearsed. He forcibly points out to them that it is to their own interest to strive that the privileges of the Roman See, "as the remedies of the whole Church"—privileges he is resolved to defend even to death—may be safeguarded. "The privileges[3] of the Apostolic See are the protection of the whole Catholic Church, its bulwark against all the attacks of the wicked. What has happened to Rothad to-day, how know you that it will not happen to you to-morrow?" Charles the Bald is informed[4] of the orders Nicholas has sent to the bishops, and is earnestly exhorted to restore Rothad to his rank, and to grant him a safe-conduct to the Pope. Finally, Rothad[5] is told not to cease proclaiming his appeal to the Apostolic See, though in another letter to him Nicholas does not fail to admonish him not to give useless trouble to himself (Rothad) nor to others, if his conscience does not fully bear him out in the matter.[6]

At first only a part of the orders of Nicholas was fulfilled. Rothad was released from confinement, but not allowed to go to Rome. A fresh batch[7] of letters from the Pope—

[1] "Decernimus ut missarum solemnia tamdiu celebrandi non habeatis licentiam, quamdiu quæ definimus perducta ad consummationem non fuerint," etc. Ep. 34.

[2] Ep. 35.

[3] "Privilegia sedis apostolicæ tegmina sunt totius Ecclesiæ catholicæ . . . . munimina sunt circa omnes impetus pravitatis," Ep. 35. History has abundantly demonstrated how much authority has been preserved by bishops who have preferred the *protection* of the State to that of the Pope. The shortcomings of popes and kings have been very different in this as in most other respects.

[4] Epp. 36, 37. [5] Ep. 38. [6] Ep. 47.

[7] Epp. 47–49 (ad an. 863). The sharp letter (Ep. 60, ad an. 864, about May) to Hincmar was written by Nicholas in ignorance of the

among them one now lost to Hincmar—had the desired result. Rothad was sent to Rome (864). At the same time Hincmar forwarded a long apology [1] for his conduct. Whilst defending himself, he over and over again professes his submission to the Pope, "because all of us, whether young or old, know that our churches are subject to the Roman Church, and that we bishops are subject to the Roman Pontiff in the primacy of Blessed Peter. Wherefore, saving our faith, which has always, and, with the help of God, will always flourish in the Church, we must obey your apostolic authority. . . . And it is only right that when the Roman Pontiff summons any bishop whatsoever to Rome, he should haste to go to him unless sickness or some serious necessity hinder him." [2]

Rothad at Rome, 864.

Till the close of the year Nicholas waited to see if any accuser of Rothad would come to Rome. None appeared; so that on Christmas Eve he was reclothed with his episcopal robes, and on the Feast of St. Agnes (January 21, 865) was formally restored to his See and sent back to France. He returned along with Arsenius, bishop of Horta, who, as we have seen, was sent at this time as legate to decide the case of Lothaire's divorce.[3] A series [4] of letters made known the restitution of Rothad to all parties concerned. Hincmar, not indeed with the best of

unavoidable difficulties which prevented Rothad from reaching Rome by the time prescribed by the Pope. Rothad reached Rome about June (864), the first, as some *imagine*, to bring to Rome the *False Decretals*.

[1] Hincmar, Ep. 2.

[2] "Omnes scimus nostras Ecclesias subditas esse Romanæ ecclesiæ, et nos episcopos in primatu b. Petri subjectos esse Romano pontifici, et ob id salva fide, quæ in Ecclesia semper viguit . . . . nobis est vestræ apostolicæ auctoritati obediendum," etc. Hinc., Ep. 2. This declaration Hincmar repeats several times; and, whilst arguing against the restoration of Rothad, assures the Pope he will submit if he sees fit to restore him.

[3] Anast., *in vit. Nic.*

[4] Epp. 72–77.

grace,[1] submitted, and Rothad ruled his See in peace till his death.

Arsenius of Horta and some papal officials.

Before adducing further examples of ecclesiastical appeal cases, lest they should prove too monotonous if treated of all together, the mention, by no means for the first time, of the name of Arsenius of Horta may be our excuse for a word or two concerning him and others like him, whom we find about the persons of the popes at this period. The power of the emperor who wished to have among the papal officials men devoted to his interests, or the influence of powerful families, managed to place round the Pope many men who would not have been respectable members of a decent lay, much less clerical, nobility. The sole thought of these men was personal aggrandisement. The presence of these *noble* officials, cleric and lay, in rapidly increasing numbers in the court of the Pope, had no little influence in bringing about the disorders which darkened the papal throne in the following period. Not to mention Sergius, a lay official, who married the niece of Pope Nicholas, afterwards abandoned her for a mistress, and plundered the papal palace while his uncle lay dying, nor the antipope Anastasius, possibly the secretary of Nicholas,[2] we will confine our attention to one who seems to have been the father of the said Anastasius, viz., Arsenius, bishop of Horta. Both Hincmar and Nicholas accuse him of pride, ambition, and avarice. And John the Deacon (the biographer of Gregory the Great), who was alive at

[1] As his language (*Annal.*, ad an. 865), when narrating these events, proves. Still, as he himself declared (Ep. ad Hinc. Laud., ap. Migne, t. 126, p. 510), he submitted completely : " Nam quod ille (Nicolaus) de Rothado sive de Vulfado judicavit, non contradixi, sed sicut ipse præcepit obedire curavi."

[2] That is on the supposition, which for my part I can scarcely accept, that Anastasius, the librarian, is the same as his namesake the antipope. See vol. ii., p. 280 ff. of this work.

this time, tells us a story concerning the bishop which bears out his reputation for being proud and a lover of display. The story, not much in itself, is, moreover, interesting, as it gives us a peep into various legal and mercantile matters of the time. It appears that despite various laws against them, and despite the fact, that they were not permitted to see the Pope, Jews contrived to do most of the trading in the more valuable kinds of merchandise. From the days of Jugurtha to those of John of Salisbury, not to come down any further, money was superior to the laws in Rome. By it the Jews brushed to one side the enactments against themselves, and contrived to bring their wares before the people. However, so indignant were the popes that the sons of Judah were able thus to set the laws at defiance, that they kept them at a distance.[1] And for fear lest any suspicion should arise that they had themselves received anything in the way of a bribe from the Jews, they would not allow them to come anywhere near their palace gates, and made them count the money they had received for their goods publicly whilst sitting on the marble pavement.[2] Among others, the magnificent wares of the Jews had an attraction for Arsenius. Not only did he purchase and wear some of them, but he positively wished to celebrate a *station* (*palatina processio*) clad, not in his priestly robes, but in his Jewish finery. It need hardly be said that Nicholas did not allow the fulfilment of such a wish.[3]

Hincmar assures us that report had it that Arsenius died (868) "talking with devils." His miserable death at Acer-

[1] *In vit. Greg. I.*, iv. 50: "Nunquam pontificalibus alloquiis fruerentur, nunquam obtutibus apostolicis potirentur."

[2] *Ib.*, c. 51: "ne viderentur aliquid de manu pontificis accepisse."

[3] *Ib.*, c. 50. "Nicolaus, ... Arsenium . . . . Judaïcas pellicias introducere molientem, adeo aversatus est, ut ei palatinam processionem vellet adimere, nisi . . . . cum sacerdotalibus infulis . . . . procedere studuisset."

enza came to be quoted in later times as a warning to the avaricious. After his sudden demise without the last sacraments, his attendants set out with his body, intending to take it to Rome or Horta. But unable to endure the stench that came from it, they hastily interred it in a field.[1]

Hincmar and Hilduin.

To give the reader some idea of the number and variety of matters that were referred to Nicholas for his decision, we will here, in brief, give some of these cases, of which the letters of Nicholas give us cognisance, now that we have discussed at some length the most important of the appeals which were addressed to him.

On the death of Thierry, bishop of Cambray, Lothaire, to strengthen his hand, appointed to the vacant bishopric Hilduin, the brother of his supporter Gunther, and a relative of the more famous Hilduin, abbot of the great monastery of St. Denis. This man, as a quite unworthy subject for such a position, Hincmar, the metropolitan of Cambray, refused to consecrate. Lothaire, however, put Hilduin into possession of the temporalities of the See, and Hincmar turned to Rome for the support of his rights. Prompt to support any just claim, Nicholas at once (863) despatched letters to the bishops of Lothaire's kingdom, to Lothaire himself, and to the intruder Hilduin. The bishops were[2] to exhort Lothaire to reject Hilduin, and to leave the clergy and people of Cambray free to choose a bishop for themselves, in accordance with the canons. Lothaire[3] is told that to the other "countless execrable charges that were made against him," he understands there is added that of interfering with the metropolitan rights of Hincmar, and of forcing an intruder into the Church of Cambray. If he does not confine himself to his proper business—which

[1] Hinc., *Annal.*, 868; *Bib. Casinensis*, iii. 139.
[2] Ep. 41. [3] Ep. 42.

is to regulate, as it were, the bodies only of his subjects—he will have to excommunicate him, especially in view of his other wicked conduct. Finally Hilduin [1] is reminded that, if the State sanctions his holding the See of Cambray, the Church never will. After some further negotiations, and after bringing pressure [2] to bear on Lothaire, through Charles the Bald and Louis the German, the rights of Hincmar were vindicated, and one John (865) was properly elected to the See.

Lothaire robs his sister Heletrude, *c.* 866.

To obtain money to buy off the Norsemen, the weak yet tyrannical Lothaire seized the possessions of his sister Heletrude, who was then a widow. Unable to obtain justice elsewhere, the injured woman appealed to the Pope. Again Nicholas took up the cause of the oppressed. To Lothaire himself, as he explains in his letter to Charles [3] the Bald on this subject, he will not write, "as for his wicked deeds he holds Lothaire excommunicated." Though Nicholas had not actually excommunicated him, he means to say that he is like one excommunicated.

But Charles and Louis the German are urged to restrain his culpable cupidity, by notifying to him the authority of the Pope and of the laws, and to see to it that the property of Heletrude is restored to her. The issue of this intercession of Nicholas we do not know. In all probability justice was done to Heletrude. Charles and Louis were ever on the lookout for a *casus belli* with Lothaire, who generally took care to give in at once when pressure was brought to bear upon him from those quarters.

Baldwin of Flanders and Judith.

If Nicholas was stern to determined vice, he was kind to the penitent. Judith, Charles the Bald's daughter,

[1] Ep. 43. [2] Ep. 83.

[3] Ep. 112. The corresponding letter, written to Louis the German, is no longer extant. "Pro nefariis ab illo abolendis . . . . excommunicatum habemus." *Ib.*

whom Ethelwulf had married on his return from Rome to his kingdom of Wessex, had on the death of her husband (858) been taken to wife by her stepson Ethelbald. Such an incestuous union shocked the people.[1] After about "two years and a half of licentiousness," Ethelbald died (860), and Judith had to return to France. On her arrival in France, Charles the Bald, her father, placed her under episcopal surveillance at Senlis, till such times as she should decide either to renounce the world or "contract a proper legal marriage."[2] She managed, however, to elope with Baldwin, count of Flanders. In great indignation, Charles had her condemned by both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. The pair fled to the kingdom of Lothaire, whence Baldwin betook himself to Rome to beg the intercession of Nicholas (862). Finding that the marriage had taken place with the fullest freedom of consent on both sides, Nicholas was moved to write in behalf of the runaways. One reason which he made use of to induce Charles to relent was lest his indignation should drive Baldwin to ally himself with the pagan Norsemen,[3] who were then inflicting so much injury on his kingdom. Nicholas assured the king he did not wish to order, only to entreat. At length (863) Charles gave his consent[4] to a legal union taking place between Judith and Baldwin. From them sprang not only

[1] Gregorovius, indeed (*Rome*, etc., iii. 130), asserts that the marriage was contracted "without the alliance being considered immoral." The contemporary Englishman Asser, however, writes: "Ethelwulf's son, Ethelbald, contrary to God's prohibition and the dignity of a Christian, ... ascended his father's bed, and married Judith . . . . and drew down much infamy upon himself from all who heard it." (*In vit. Alfredi.*) Such is the language also of the later chroniclers of England. *Cf.* Pauli's *Life of Alfred*, p. 63; Lingard, *Hist. Eng.*, i. p. 96.

[2] The very words of Hincmar's *Annals*, ad an. 862.

[3] Ep. 22. *Cf.* Epp. 23, 36.

[4] Hinc., *Ann.*, ad an. 863. *Cf.* Nic., Ep. 109, and Ep. Hinc. 2. "Baldwinus, Nichola P. agente, Judith coram patre Karolo desponsat." *Ann. Blandinienses*, 863, ap. *M. G. SS.*, v.

the line of the counts of Flanders, but what is of much more interest to us, Matilda, the wife of William the Conqueror.

Solomon, king of Brittany.

The efforts which we have seen[1] made by Nomenoius to free Brittany from all dependence on Charles the Bald, and its bishops from all subjection to any archbishop in Charles' kingdom, were continued by Solomon. He succeeded to the dukedom (857) by the murder of his cousin Herispoius. He endeavoured to induce Nicholas to recognise the bishops whom Nomenoius had forcibly intruded, and apparently sent the Pope a very specious account of the preceding negotiations on the subject. Nicholas wrote[2] (862) to Solomon, "king of the Bretons," to let him know that his researches into the archives of the Holy See showed him that the letters of popes Leo IV., Benedict III., and of himself were to a different effect than that represented by the king. Hence the question of the deposed bishops could not be regarded as settled, but must be referred either to the metropolitan, the archbishop of Tours, with twelve bishops, or to the Pope himself. As to which See was to enjoy metropolitan rights over Brittany, Nicholas wisely temporised. That question could be considered when peace had been made between Solomon and Charles.

Peace was made between the two in the following year (863), and Solomon renewed his request that Dol might be recognised as the metropolitan See of Brittany. Nicholas, however, refused[3] to accede to the petition, on the ground that no proof had been sent to him that the pallium had ever before been sent to the bishops of Dol. He ordered Festinianus of Dol to submit to the jurisdiction of the See of Tours in accordance with the previous decrees of the

[1] Vol. ii., p. 295 ff. of this work. [2] Ep. 25.
[3] Epp. 85 (ad an. 865) and 92 (ad an. 866).

popes and with ancient custom.[1] And he made it plain[2] that he objected to civil differences interfering with the rights of churches. He had evidently no sympathy with men who wished to make use of the Church in their attempts to secure independence for themselves at the expense of the unity of established kingdoms. But not even a decree of Nicholas settled this debated point. As already noticed, it took more than three hundred years to settle the question of the rights of Dol and Tours.

The convent of St. Calais and Robert of Le Mans.

Another dispute referred to the decision of Nicholas had already lasted as long as the 'Dol' question was yet to endure. It was a disagreement as to jurisdiction over a monastery, which was at first known as Anisol (or Anille), from the river on which it was built, but afterwards, with the small town that grew up round it, as St. Calais (in Latin, Karilefus), from its founder (†542). Originally the monastery was subject to the jurisdiction of the neighbouring bishop of Le Mans. But, according to the favour or disfavour with which it was regarded by the sovereign of the country in which it was situated, it was withdrawn from, or resubjected to, the authority of the bishop of Le Mans. At the period of which we are now treating it was the fashion to favour the monastery. Synods (*e.g.* that of Pistres, 862) under Hincmar decided for Anisol. And, in 863, Nicholas himself confirmed[3] its privileges, on the ground of its long immunity from the jurisdiction of Le Mans. The laws placed a limit,[4] he

[1] Ep. 91. "Restat . . . . ut . . . . ipsius (Turonensis Ecclesiæ) judicium exquirere non detrectent (vestri episcopi), sicut se habent monumenta decessorum nostrorum pontificum et priorum exempla evidenter ostendunt."

[2] Ep. 92. [3] Ep. 45.

[4] That limit, he says, was thirty years for civil causes, and forty for ecclesiastical ones. "In legibus enim habemus, ut omnes quæstiones infra 30 annos terminum accipiant. De ecclesiasticis autem causis, post quadragesimum annum nulla querela moveri potest, si non intra hoc spatium annorum fuerit mota." *Ib.*

urged, to the period in which rights could be called in question.

Robert, bishop of Le Mans, however, appealed to the Pope against the sentence of the councils which had non-suited his claims. Nicholas accordingly ordered[1] the affair to be gone into again by a fresh council (863). One which met at Verberie (October 863) found in favour of the monastery. The documents with which Robert attempted to prove his claims were declared forgeries and ordered to be burnt. Anisol became definitely independent.[2]

Other appeals.

Dealing with bishops and counts, priests and deacons, we see Nicholas informing[3] Charles, archbishop of Mayence, and his suffragans, that he cannot see his way to passing any adverse sentence on Solomon, bishop of Constance; ordering[4] Stephen, count of Auvergne, to restore Sigon, bishop of Clermont, to his See, on pain of being interdicted from wine and flesh; cautioning[5] Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, not to interfere with a certain priest if he sees fit to appeal to the Apostolic See; and restoring[6] the deacon Pepo, who had been uncanonically condemned by his bishop.

John of Ravenna.

True to the traditions of his See, and in harmony with his conduct during the pontificate of Leo IV., John, archbishop of Ravenna, gave Nicholas a great deal of trouble by his insubordinate and tyrannical conduct. Deputations from Ravenna waited upon the Pope, praying him to relieve them from the oppressions of their archbishop, who was depriving them both of their property and of their rights. By legates and letters Nicholas endeavoured to reclaim John. The only notice the archbishop took of the paternal admonitions of the Pope was to go from bad to

[1] *Cf.* his letters (50–54) to bishop Robert, Charles the Bald, etc.

[2] Hefele, *Conc.*, v. pp. 296, 406, 468, 499. Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, July 1.

[3] Ep. 26, ap. *P. L.*, p. 809.

[4] Ep. 24. *Ib.*, p. 805.

[5] Ep. 70, p. 890.

[6] *L. P.*, n. xliii.

worse. The librarian[1] says of him that he excommunicated people without just ground, prevented others from going to Rome, arbitrarily seized property, even property belonging to the See of Rome, and interfered with its ecclesiastical rights. For he passed sentence upon clerics, not only on those subject to his own jurisdiction, but also on many in Æmelia who were directly subject to Rome. Anastasius thinks it not wonderful that John, in the later years of his pontificate, acted in that lawless manner, as in the very beginning of his rule, like his predecessor Felix, he either falsified documents preserved in the episcopal archives of the city (no doubt those which showed the true relations between Ravenna and Rome), or added forged ones to them.

Synod at Rome, 861.

Thrice summoned to Rome to give an account of his conduct before a council, he boastfully declared that he was not bound to attend any council there (861). Finding him contumacious, and, moreover, accused of heresy, the Pope excommunicated him in a synod held, perhaps, about Easter.[2]

John, however, again imitating the conduct of certain of his predecessors, tried to secure the support of the secular power. He betook himself to Pavia, and gained the ear of the emperor. Louis sent him to Rome with ambassadors of his own to support his claims. By pointing out to the ambassadors how wrongly they had acted in remaining in communion with one who had been excommunicated, Nicholas had no difficulty in detaching them from the archbishop's cause. But John himself was not so amenable to admonitions of duty. He left the city, refusing to give any undertaking that he would present himself for judgment at a synod to be held on November 1, 861.[3]

Nicholas goes to Ravenna, 861.

Weary of the tyranny of John, "the senators of the city

[1] *In vit. Nich.*

[2] *L. P.*, n. xxiii., and vol. ii., p. 168, n. 21.

[3] *L. P.*

of Ravenna," and many of the inhabitants of other cities in Æmilia, came to the Pope and begged him to go to Ravenna and see for himself what was being done. This the Pope did, and at once restored to the injured people the property of which they had been plundered by the archbishop and his brother.[1]

John, who had meanwhile again set out for Pavia, did not win the same reception as he had received on the occasion of his previous visit. Headed by their bishop, Luitard, one of the chief counsellors of the emperor Louis, the people would not receive the excommunicated archbishop into their houses, nor sell anything to his followers, so anxious were they not to share in his excommunication. This strong manifestation of their sentiments on the part of his people had its effect upon the emperor. When John asked him to support him a second time, he sent word to him by a messenger that he had better go and humble himself before the Pope, to whom[2] both he himself (Louis) and the whole Church were subject. However, after much difficulty, he secured the company of deputies from the emperor, and set out for Rome. To their intercession on the archbishop's behalf Nicholas would not listen, but remained firm in his determination to bring him to justice. "If our dear son the emperor," he said, "had made himself thoroughly acquainted with his doings, so far from interceding in his behalf he would have compelled him to come to us, however unwilling he might have been."

Roman synod, Nov. 861.

In obedience to the Pope's orders, the bishops of the neighbouring provinces assembled for the November synod, the first session of which was held "in the Leonine palace" —part of the work of Leo IV. on the Vatican hill.[3]

[1] *Ib.*

[2] *Ib.* "Cui (Papæ) et nos et omnis Ecclesiæ generalitas inclinatur."

[3] Still the *L. P.*

Finding himself abandoned by all, John begged for mercy, and drew up in clear and precise language, "according to the custom of his predecessors," the terms of the oath of fidelity and obedience he owed to the Pope. We read in Nicholas's biographer, that with this document in his hand, John appeared before the Pope, bishops, and nobles assembled in council, that he placed it in turn on the cross, on the sandals[1] of Our Lord, and on a copy of the Holy Gospels, and that in fine, holding his act of submission in hand, he declared aloud that he would for the rest of his life faithfully act up to its provisions.

A day or so later, at another session held in the Lateran basilica, John cleared himself of the charge of heresy, and was restored to communion.

Next day, which was apparently November 18, John again appeared before the Pope and the college of cardinals,[2] to hear the charges brought against him by the bishops of Æmilia and others. From the papal biographer, and from an extant fragment (?) of this council, it appears that the following decrees were passed in reference to him:—He was to come to Rome every year; was not to consecrate

[1] *Ib.* Had John brought them with him from Ravenna? *Cf.* vol. ii., p. 119 of this work. This relic must have been left at Rome. John the Deacon, *Ecclesia Lateranensis* (twelfth century, ap. *P. L.*, t. 114) mentions them as preserved in the *Sancta Sanctorum* oratory, near the Lateran.

[2] *Ib.* "Et juxta morem residente sanctissimo sacerdotum et coepiscoporum collegio." Comparing what is here said by the *L. P.* with the fragment (?) of a Roman council, published by Muratori (*R. I. S.*, ii., pt. i., and Migne, t. 106, p. 787), it seems that Hefele is correct in identifying the fragment (?) with the third session of this council, and consequently that Jaffé is not right in supposing this document to contain the acts of a council held in 862. Similarly we would refer to the earlier date in this year the fragment of a Roman council (ap. *R. I. S.*, ii., pt. ii., p. 127; Migne, t. 119, p. 794), in which we find John of Ravenna excommunicated on a charge of heresy brought against him by Nandecisus, bishop of Pola, and for not answering a summons to a council. In the synod of November 861 John cleared himself of the charge of heresy.

the bishops of Æmilia (the country round Milan, according to Hefele) except after a canonical election by the duke, clergy, and people, and after the reception of a written authorisation from the Pope; was not to interfere with the aforesaid bishops when they wished to come to Rome, nor was he to exact any payment or service from them not sanctioned by the canons; nor, in fine, was he to possess himself of property, whether apparently belonging to the Holy See or to others, except after proof of legal claim in presence of the proper authorities, *i.e.* of the Pope himself at Rome or of his representatives, his *missus* or his *vestararius*,[1] at Ravenna. On the conclusion of the publication of these decrees, the members of the council cried out: "Just is the judgment of the Pastor of the whole Church. With him we are all in accord!"[2]

The synodal decree,[3] which was signed by some seventy bishops, gives in detail the arbitrary doings of the archbishop. Every two years he 'visited' his suffragans, and stayed so long with them with all his court as well nigh to ruin them. John also made them thrice every year send 'presents' of food and drink to himself and his chief officials, and in various other ways interfered with their rights or their property. It was as a ready means of putting a curb on the tyranny of such metropolitans as John of Ravenna that made the *False Decretals* so rapidly popular. The fact that John was deposed in 863 for siding against the Pope with Gunther shows that his submission on this occasion was only verbal.[4]

[1] According to Du Cange, in *voce*, vestararius is the same as vestiarius. In a fragment of a letter of John VIII. there is mention of a "vestararius of Ravenna," to whom the keys of the city were entrusted. *Ib.* *Cf. L. P.*, ii., p. 169, n. 32.

[2] *L. P.* [3] Ap. *P. L.*, t. 106, p. 788; *L. P.*, n. xxxiii. ff.

[4] Compare this account of the affair of John of Ravenna, which is that of Anastasius, and is supported by the official evidence of councils,

Gotteschalc and Predestination.

Of what heresy John was accused we have no means of knowing, unless, indeed, as is most likely, the decrees (cc. 2, 3, 4) of the council of 861 against those who held that Our Lord suffered not merely in His human but also in His divine nature, and that baptism was not equally efficacious for all, were aimed against him. Certainly the latter decree strikes at the *absolute predestination* doctrine of Gotteschalc who, we know, in 846 had made a pilgrimage to Rome, and had, on his return journey through Italy, broached his theories at the house of a friend in the North.[1] Or he may, perchance, have been charged with at least countenancing that German monk. At any rate, the latter's heretical views were the ones most in evidence at the period of which we are writing. Gotteschalc, whose name, as might be anticipated, is spelt in many different ways, revived the heresy which had been promulgated in Gaul, four centuries before his time, by the Gaulish priest Lucidus. He taught the awful doctrine of 'absolute predestination.' Of a disposition naturally rash, headstrong, and intractable,[2] he was soured by being compelled to remain a monk against his will. He was understood to teach "that the good were inevitably predestined by God to eternal life

with that given by the author of the *Libellus de Imp. potest.* (ap. Watterich, i. p. 629). That anonymous imperial partisan says that Nicholas acted against John 'from envy,' because the latter was on very good terms with the emperor (*qui serviens imperatori familiarior erat*); and, it would seem, attributes to Louis, in his alleged partisanship of John, the deeds of violence in the Pentapolis which had been done by John himself. His authority is, however, not comparable to that of Anastasius and the 'Councils.'

[1] Prudent., *Ann.*, 849.

[2] He says of himself (Ep. ad Ratram., ap. Jager, *Hist. de l'Église C. en France*, v. p. 82) that he was, "Stultorum princeps abrupta per omnia præceps." And in harmony with that, Hincmar informs the Pope (Ep. 2) that he was "Habitu monachus, mente ferinus, quietis impatiens, et vocum novitate delectans, ac inter suos mobilitate noxia singularis."

and the bad to everlasting death."[1] But in his confessions he was careful not to say whether the predestination to eternal death imposed any necessity on man's will. Unfortunately, in the replies issued against his teaching, this point was not pressed home; and confusion was caused by some of his orthodox opponents, in their anxiety to unmask his terrible sophisms, not admitting, in the proper restricted sense, double predestination. Beginning to propagate his views before the close of the first half of the ninth century, he soon attracted attention to them. Many works were published on this most difficult subject of 'predestination,' and not unnaturally there was no little confusion of expression, if not of thought, in some of the productions. Some of their authors were probably sounder in belief than in their mode of propounding that belief. A word or two on the subject of predestination may perhaps (we may hope not by way of example) make it clear how confusion of expression and mutual misunderstanding could readily arise among heated writers on this abstruse topic.

It will not be denied that it is impossible for anything to happen except by the will of God, *i.e.* either by His direct or, at least, by His 'permissive' will. Everything, therefore, which comes about may be said, from that point of view, to come about in virtue of the will of God. Now it is the teaching of the Church that God gives to every man sufficient grace to be saved. But one man, using the free will which God has given to him, will avail himself of God's proferred grace and be saved, another will reject it and be lost. Hence, in the sense noted above, God may be said to will the damnation of the latter and the salvation of the former. Further, as He 'foreknows' who

[1] The words of the contemporary *Annals of Fulda*, ad an. 848. Fulda was the monastery in which he was compelled to become and remain a monk.

will embrace His grace and be saved, and who will neglect it and be damned, He may be said to 'predestine' the one to eternal life and the other to the second death. It will, however, be observed that the reward or punishment is 'predestined' in view of foreseen merit or demerit. So that God may be said rather to predestine "eternal death to some men rather than some to eternal death."

It will be obvious from what has been said, that the same form of phrase, on the subject of predestination, may be either orthodox or heretical; and, from the complexity of the question, doubtless still clearer that a writer might easily be really in mind or in intention quite orthodox, and yet unwittingly use heretical phrases. Thus, if it be said that God "predestines a man to hell," the expression would be heretical if the words are to be understood 'as they stand,' in their strict sense, or absolutely. But they will be orthodox if they be meant to convey the idea that God, foreseeing that a man will freely elect to walk along the road that leads to the bottomless pit, permits him to arrive there, or to put it more strongly, decrees eternal punishment for him as the natural consequence of his evil choice. Once again, the similarly ill-sounding phrase that "Christ died only for the elect" would be orthodox, if it be explained to mean that Christ died 'efficaciously' for the elect only, as they alone availed themselves of the merits of His death.

When the views of Gotteschalc became public, they were immediately controverted. Some, however, either because they were in sympathy with his doctrine or with himself,[1] or because they thought he had been misunder-

[1] He had not only been forced to be a monk against his will, but, besides being condemned in various councils from that of Mayence (848) to that of Tousy (860), had even been whipped for his unsound doctrine, in view of a rule of St. Benedict for the treatment of refractory monks. Gotteschalc died (868) without being reconciled to the Church.

stood, took up their pens in his favour. The controversy lasted some ten years. Not merely learned men, but councils, were ranged on both sides; facts which have their explanation almost more in this, that the latter were held in countries often hostile to each other, and that the former were not unfrequently occupants of rival Sees, rather than in real opposition to doctrine. Both parties brought their arguments under the notice of the Pope. Among others, Hincmar also informed Nicholas of the doctrine of Gotteschalc, begged him to check his account of it by the testimony of others, and said that, if his "authority wished the monk to be released and sent to him or to some other bishop he might appoint in order that the affair might be further investigated, he had no objection to offer."[1]

Prudentius, bishop of Troyes, who was the author of part of the *Annals of St. Bertin*, even goes the length of asserting[2] that Pope Nicholas published decrees on grace and free will, "on the truth of the twofold predestination" (viz., to life and death eternal), and on the dogma that the blood of Christ was shed for all believers. But, as we learn[3] from the continuation of the same annals, written by Hincmar, Prudentius was a partisan of Gotteschalc. And in another place,[4] citing this very passage of the annals of Prudentius, Hincmar declares that such a statement is not to be found anywhere else; and he

[1] Ep. 2 *ad fin.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 126.

[2] Ad an. 859. "Nicolaus, pontifex Romanus, de gratia Dei et libero arbitrio, de veritate geminæ prædestinationis et sanguine Christi, ut pro credentibus omnibus fusus sit, fideliter confirmat et catholice decernit."

[3] Ad an. 861. "Prudentius . . . . qui ante aliquot annos Getescalco prædestinatiano restiterat, post felle commotus contra quosdam secum hæretico resistentes, ipsius hæresis defensor acerrimus, indeque non modica inter se diversa et fidei adversa scriptitans moritur."

[4] Ep. ix., ad Egilonem, *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 70.

conjures Egilo, archbishop of Sens, to whom he was writing, to let the Pope know what Prudentius had asserted, so that no scandal might arise in the Church, as it certainly would were men to think that the Pope had the same belief as Gotteschalc.

There is no doubt that Hincmar is correct in this matter. Nicholas prudently abstained from intervening in the controversy. He examined witnesses as to what was going on, received (863) the works of Hincmar on 'Predestination,'[1] and especially interested himself in the treatment that was being meted out to Gotteschalc. Hence Hincmar was careful to instruct[2] (866) Egilo of Sens to assure the Pope that the unhappy monk was abundantly supplied with food, clothing, and all necessaries.

By his prudent reserve in not allowing himself to be drawn into the midst of the confusion of the 'predestination' controversy, Nicholas effected more than he could have done by any active interference. His policy of non-intervention resulted in the close of the dispute with the death (868) of its author.[3] The Pope knew that men who were not fanatical would hold fast to the truths that God has given free-will to man; that it requires the grace of God to win heaven; that no man will lose his soul except through his own fault, and that it was not their affair to reconcile these truths one with the other or

[1] *Ib.*, Ep. ii., ad Papam, *l. c.*, p. 43. [2] Ep. ix.

[3] It was said at the time that Gotteschalc himself had appealed to the Pope. At any rate it was reported to Hincmar that a monk, who was friendly to the heretic, and who was an inmate of the monastery where Gotteschalc was confined, 'took himself off' to carry his friend's appeal to Rome. "Et sicut mihi dictum est (writes Hincmar, *ib.*, Ep. ix.), quasi ipsius Gothescalci reclamationem vult (viz., the runaway monk, Gunthbert), perferre ad domnum apostolicum." On the whole 'predestination controversy,' see Hefele's *Councils*, v. (French ed.). In § 458, however, for "they *added* to canon 4," we ought to read, "they *struck out* of canon 4."

with the supreme dominion of God over everything. He knew that words would be powerless against practical belief.

John Scott *Ierugena*, later Erigena.

Before leaving Gotteschalc, it may be noted with some interest that one of those who by their writings on the subject of predestination only added to existing confusion, was John Scott the Erin-born[1]; and that, too, though his work was directed against him. Much less a steady theologian than a ready-witted, pantheistic philosopher, his refutation of Gotteschalc contained more false teachings, philosophical and otherwise, than the work he took in hand to answer, and brought upon himself various literary missiles, such as canons of councils which condemned all 'Scots' porridge,'[2] and the keen eyes of Nicholas. Hence, when at the request of Charles the Bald the clever Irishman published some time later a translation of the work *De divinis nominibus*, then attributed to St. Dionysius the Areopagite, Nicholas wrote[3] to Charles to let him know, that 'according to custom,' the book ought to be sent to him for his judgment, "the more so that the said John, though reported to be a man of much learning, was at one time by common report declared not to be sound on certain points. Accordingly let your industry make good what has been omitted, and at once send us the aforesaid work, that, approved by us, it may, in virtue of our authority, be the more readily received by everybody

[1] He was "the first of the schoolmen to attempt an independent system of philosophical speculation," independent, *i.e.*, of the tradition of the Fathers; and with him the first period of scholastic philosophy is said to have begun.

[2] Council of Valence, 855, can. 6.

[3] Ep. 115, ad Carolum Regem. (*P. L.*, p. 1119). In her *Studies in John the Scott*, p. 135, Miss Gardener seems to have followed a false reading of this letter in thinking that Scotus himself had to be sent to Rome. *Cf.* her note, p. 139. With her work should be compared Turner's *Hist. of Philosophy*, p. 246 ff.

without hesitation." This fragment is very interesting, as it shows that a papal censorship of at least famous theological works was practised in the ninth century.

In the history of Christianity, the ninth century is marked out by the conversion of the Slavs,[1] like ourselves, members of the great Aryan or Indo-European family. The Slavs, though by no means to the extent commonly supposed as far as the first two qualities are concerned, were a quiet, peaceful, democratic people, devoted to pastoral pursuits, and later on, after their westward and southern migration, to commerce. They came originally from the plain of Central Europe, the region of the Don, Dnieper, and Vistula.[2] Hence, as "die Weidenden" probably means the "dwellers on the great prairie,"[3] they were known to the Germans, who afterwards subdued some branches of them, as Wends. They called themselves Serbes. The Slavs.

The Slavs began to move southwards at the end of the second century, but at first rather as auxiliaries, slaves or vassals of other tribes. They began to make their appearance within the Roman provinces as conquerors on their own account at the end of the fifth century,[4] and continued their ravages for two centuries. By the middle of the

[1] Some derive this word from the Slavonic 'slava,' which means 'glory,' others from 'slovo,' which in the same language means 'word'; though, indeed, both words are from the same root, and in Little-Russian *slava* means *discourse*, as Morfill (*Slavonic Literature*, pp. 35 and 257) notes. To the Slavs other peoples were Niem (*mutes*), they alone had the true speech or word. 'Sedlo,' seat, is another derivation; and a very probable derivation is found in 'slowecz,' a man, or warrior. Hence in the 'Slavs' we should see 'the people.'

[2] "Habitationis locum subinde mutant, ... sparsim et rare positis tabernaculis regionem obtinent, quo fit ut magnum occupent spatium." Procopius, *De Bello Gothico*, iii. c. 14.

[3] Others say it means "the dwellers by the water" (the Baltic), from a root *wenda*. *Cf.* Russian *voda*, Latin *unda*.

[4] Their first recorded raid across the Danube was in 493, their second in 517.

seventh century almost the whole of the Balkan peninsula was covered with their colonies, and they had pushed as far west as Bavaria. Traces of their settlements are still to be discovered in various parts, *e.g.* in Greece, where for a long period none of their direct descendants have been found.

By the end of the seventh century Slav migration towards the West ceased. Since that time, while losing territory in that direction, they have made up for it by colonising Eastern and Northern Russia. Of the various branches of the Slavs, there was originally the greatest divergence between the Slavs of the East (Russians), and of the South (Sloveni or Serbes, Croats, Bulgarians, etc.), on the one hand, and those of the West (Lechs, etc.) on the other. This difference was, of course, accentuated when the latter came into contact with Rome and the Teutons, and the former began to be influenced by the Byzantine empire and the East. Of the action of these different sources of influence on the Slavs we shall have to treat immediately.

In a broad way, the different families of the Slavs occupy now the same territory as at the close of the seventh century,[1] though it was not till the invasion of the Magyars at the end of the ninth century that they began to form separate states. Nowadays the different Slav races may be enumerated as follows. Under the Slavs of the South and East are reckoned the Russians, Bulgarians,[2] and lastly, the Illyrians, who include the Serbes, Croats, and Wends or Slovens of Carinthia; and under those of the West, the Lechs, who embrace the Poles, Silesians, and Pomeranians,

[1] Then they settled in Carniola (Carinthia), Illyricum, Macedonia, Mœsia, and Pannonia.

[2] Strictly speaking the Bulgarians were not Slavs, but only Slav-speaking. *Cf.* p. 111.

the Czechs or Bohemians, with whom are counted the Moravians and Slovaks; and the Polabians, who represent the disappearing Slavonic tribes of North Germany.[1]

Their religion.

These various Slavonic tribes seem to have had a vague idea of a Supreme Being, who was, later on, worshipped as the thunder maker,[2] and perhaps impersonated by an idol known as Perun.[3] Like the Hindoos, they were very fond of 'many-headed' gods. At Arcona, the capital of the isle of Rugen, the Danish missionaries found 'Svantovit' (Holy Light), an idol with four heads.[4] At Stettin was the triple-headed Triglav. There was also, among many of the tribes, a Persian Dualism. They recognised good (Bieli-Bog)[5] and bad (Tcherni-Bog) gods; or, more exactly, white and black gods. Procopius assures us that they were given in times of danger to the making of vows, which they most religiously performed, and also to the practice of divination. Their mode of worship was not unlike that of the Druids, and like them the northern Slavs, at any rate, offered

[1] *Cf. Histoire gén.*, vol. i. *Les Origines*, p. 688 *seq.*, by Lavisse. Instructive is Mr. Freeman's essay on *The Southern Slaves* (Historical Essays, Third Series). See also Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, ii., p. 11 f., p. 114 f., and especially chapters i. and ii. of Leger's *Cyrille et Méthode*.

[2] So says Procopius, *De Bello Gothico*, iii. 14 (ap. *R. I. S.*, i. 313). "Unum enim Deum, fulguris effectorem dominum hujus universitatis solum agnoscunt," etc. "Præterea fluvios colunt et Nymphas et alia quædam numina." *Cf.* Helmold., *Chron. Slav.*, i. 84.

[3] The treaties, cited by the old Russian chronicle assigned to Nestor (monk at Kiew, †1116), between the Greeks and the Russians, were always closed with the formula: "May he who shall violate this treaty be accursed of God, *Peroun*, and Volos (od Boha, od *Perouna*)," Leger, p. 19.

[4] See *Saxo Grammaticus* (L. xiv. p. 564 ff.) for a graphic account of its destruction under Waldemar I., king of Denmark, in Saxo's own time, as also of that of Rugie-Vitus with seven faces and of Pere-Vitus with five.

[5] *Bog* is said to be identical with the Sanskrit, *bhaga*, and is the proper name of a Vedic divinity. *Cf. Stribog* (god of cold) and other similar gods of the Russian, ap. *Chron. Nest.*, c. 38.

even human sacrifices. Originally, at least, they held their religious services in the open air, in the woods and forests, which they peopled with inferior gods, fairies, and the like.

Character. Of a well-formed frame, and by no means wanting in courage, the Slav, though said to be fond of liberty, lacked and still lacks independence of character. Though hospitable, musical, and cheerful, they were not (locally, at any rate) without cruel customs. Mothers were at liberty to destroy their infant daughters, and sons to kill their fathers when from old age they were no longer useful to the State. Wives were often obliged (another connection with the religions of India) to cast themselves upon the fire which consumed the dead bodies of their husbands. The Slavs held their women in very little account; they regarded them as beneath them.[1]

Hence, concludes Leger,[2] "by their manners and customs, by their religion, at once simple and poetical, by their patriarchal constitutions, the Slavs were evidently better predisposed to the coming of Christianity than any other race. With an external worship calculated to satisfy their imagination, it came to bring them the solution of those great problems of the Unity of God, the origin of evil, the immortality of the soul, with which they were acquainted, and which their own naïve myths had endeavoured to resolve."

First converts to Christianity. As far as we know, the truths of Christianity were first accepted (apart from the conversion of individual Slavs) by the Croats in Dalmatia. Their king, Porga, and many of his people were baptized under Pope John IV.[3] (640–642), himself a Dalmatian. Contact with Bavaria brought

[1] *Cf.* Alzog, § 180, The Slavonians and their mythology; Balan, *Delle Relaz. fra la Chiesa Cat. e gli Slavi*, pp. 11, 12; Morfill, *Slavonic Literature*, an invaluable little book, p. 43, quoting from the *Strategicum* of the emperor Maurice, the friend of Gregory the Great.

[2] P. 36.

[3] *Cf.* vol. i., pt. i., p. 362 of this work.

the faith to the Slavs of Carinthia[1] (the country between the Drave and the Danube) at the end of the eighth century.

Events in Moravia,[2] however, were most instrumental in bringing about the conversion of the Slavs. Strife among the chiefs of the Moravians brought German interference into their affairs. Though satisfied with the truths of Christianity which the Germans introduced into his country, the great duke of Moravia, Radislav (or Rastices), in order to be quite independent, determined to obtain teachers of the new doctrines rather from the weak Greeks than from his political enemies, the powerful Germans. In reply to his request for missionaries, Michael III. sent him (863) perhaps the two most famous brothers in the history of Christianity, S. Constantine, better known by his religious name of Cyril, and S. Methodius, the glorious apostles of the Slavs. Of these devoted men, to whom the Slavs most properly pay such honour, whose 'cult' has been so much advanced by the late Pope (Leo XIII.), and whom Nicholas summoned to Rome, but was not destined to behold, we shall have much to say under the *life* of Hadrian II.

The Bulgarians.

But the Slavs with whom Pope Nicholas was most concerned were the Bulgarians. The Bulgarians properly belonged to the Ugro-Finnish or the Ugro-Altaic branch of the great Turanian family. Akin to the Huns and Avars, they moved south from their homes in the north of modern Russia in the early centuries of the Christian era. Of their earlier history Oman[3] writes: "This Ugrian tribe,

[1] "The Slavs of Carinthia and Styria were only converted, generally, after they had been conquered by the Franks. . . . The two countries formed part of the diocese of Salzburg." Leger, p. 51. The tradition of the Slavs is that they were first converted by St. Paul and his disciple Andronicus (Ros. xvi. 7). *Cf.* Nestor, c. 20.

[2] *Cf.* vol. ii., p. 175 ff. of this work.

[3] *Europe*, 476–918 (p. 248). *Cf.* Bury, *Later Roman Empire*.

who had dwelt for the last two centuries (fifth and sixth) beyond the Danube, crossed the river[1] in the end of Constantine's (IV., Pogonatus) reign (668–685), and then threw themselves on the Slavonic tribes who held Mœsia." . . . . Constantine at length "allowed the Bulgarians to settle without further opposition in the land between the Danube and the Balkans, where the Slavs had hitherto held possession (679). A new Bulgarian nation was gradually formed by the intermixture of the conquering tribe and their subjects; when formed it displayed a Slavonic rather than a Ugrian type, and spoke a Slavonic not a Ugrian tongue." In the ninth century they began to extend towards the south-west, and in the tenth century ruled from Varna and the mouths of the Danube to the mountains of Thessaly and Phocis. That is, at the time of the greatest extent of Bulgaria's rule, under the sway of its Tsar Simeon (892–927), it embraced nearly the whole of the Balkan peninsula, part of Hungary and Walachia, and was the suzerain of the Serbes.

Conversion of the Bulgarians.

Contact with the Byzantine empire brought the Bulgarians into constant touch with Christianity. But at first it made little progress among them. One of their kings, Telerig, on embracing Christianity, had to abandon his throne (777). The wars between them and the Greeks resulted, in the early years of the following century, in a great many of the latter being conveyed as prisoners into Bulgaria. Through them, though such Christians as had not fled from the country during the different barbarian invasions, and especially through Manuel, archbishop of Adrianople, which was captured by the Bulgarians in 813, Christianity made some headway. It was not, however, till the reign of King Boris, or Bogoris (852–888), that it was at all firmly established. His sister had been baptized

[1] They seem to have made their first raid across the Danube in 499.

whilst a captive at Constantinople. In fulfilment of a vow, Boris got himself baptized (864), according to the Sclavonic and Greek legends, by a Byzantine bishop, Joseph or Clement, and had for godfather the emperor Michael III.[1] But according to the well-informed contemporary Anastasius, in his oft-cited *Preface*, the sacrament was administered by a Roman priest named Paul.

Next year (865) Photius sent to the Bulgarian prince a long letter[2] explanatory of Christian faith and duty. Borrowed largely from Isocrates's letter of exhortation to Nicocles, it was much too learned for the convert barbarian. He was, moreover, still further troubled by various doctrines which were poured into his ears by different Eastern heretics.

Accordingly, whether it was that he was "perplexed[3] Boris turns to Rome, 866. . . . . by these written arguments" of Photius or by the contradictions of the Easterns; or that he was vexed because Photius would not at once establish[4] a complete hierarchy in Bulgaria; or that he feared that ecclesiastical subjection to Constantinople might be followed by civil; or whether in consequence of a childish love of change, or of a cunning scheme to play off one party against the other, certain it is

[1] It is stated by Maclear, *The Slavs* (in the *Conversion of the West* Series), p. 55, that Bogoris was baptized by Photius, and that S. Methodius, the brother of S. Cyril, came to paint for the king. One of these statements is erroneous; the other, that Methodius, the artist, was the same person as the apostle of the Slavs, is of very doubtful truth. The work of Maclear is more readable than exact, and should be corrected by Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, and Hergenröther, *Hist. de l'Église*, iii. *Cf.* also Lapôtre, *Jean VIII.*, ch. 2. Balan, *La Chiesa Cattolica e gli Slavi*, p. 16, also needs correction. A good outline of the history of *Bulgaria* is given in pt. ii. of *The Balkan States*, one of the *Stories of the Nations* Series. See also *La Bulgarie Chrétienne*, by A. d'Avril, Paris, 1898, and *Hist. des Littératures Slaves*, by Pypine and Spasovic, French ed., Paris, 1881.

[2] Ap. Migne, *P. G.*, t. 102. Ep. 6, ed. Baletta.

[3] Maclear, *The Slavs*, p. 57.

[4] Lapôtre, p. 49 f.

that, in 866, Boris "determined[1] to go straight to the fountain-head," and sent a solemn[2] embassy to Rome to put the infant Church of his country under the care of the Pope. Among the presents which his envoys brought "for St. Peter" were "the arms with which he was equipped when, in Christ's name, he overcame his (pagan) adversaries." Very valuable or very curious, the gifts of the Bulgarian monarch appear to have aroused the cupidity of the emperor Louis, who was then at Beneventum. At any rate he sent an order to the Pope that they should be transmitted to him. Through his partisan, Arsenius of Horta, Nicholas sent him some of them, but excused himself from sending all.[3]

Meanwhile, however, he had despatched[4] (866) two men "of great sanctity"—Paul, bishop of Populonia, and the famous Formosus, bishop of Porto, of whom we shall hear much more—to preach the faith to Boris and his people. They travelled with Donatus and the other legates who were going to Constantinople. He also sent, in the shape of his "Replies[5] to the questions addressed to him by the Bulgarians," a document which, based to some extent on the instructions of S. Gregory I. to S. Augustine, served, among other purposes, as a "species of code[6] of civil constitutions for an uncivilised nation."

The 'Responsa' of Pope Nicholas.

At the outset of his famous *Responsa*, Nicholas explained

[1] Such are the words of Maclear, *l. c.*

[2] *L. P.*, n. lxviii. "Tunc ad hunc . . . . præsulem legatos suos mense Augusto Indictione XIV., destinavit, donaque . . . . contulit, suggerens ejus Apostolatui quid se facere salubrius oporteret." *Cf. Ann. Fuld.*, 866.

[3] *Ann. Hincmar*, an. 866. [4] *L. P.*

[5] "Responsa Nicolai ad consulta Bulgarorum," ap. *P. L.*, t. 119, pp. 978–1017. *Cf. L. P.*, *l. c.*

[6] Gregorovius, *Rome*, iii. 127. With extraordinary inaccuracy Hore (p. 370) speaks of Nicholas's letter as "dwelling on no less than 106 points condemnatory of the Greek teaching."

that Christianity consisted of faith and good works. He then proceeded to give his questioners various instructions on the sacrament of baptism and matrimony. With regard to the latter sacrament he reminded them that the most important part of it was the mutual consent. Entering upon some explanation of the marriage ceremonies, he speaks of the blessing and the reception of the veil, and of the happy pair leaving the church with crowns upon their heads—crowns which are wont, says the Pope, to be kept in the church for the purpose.[1] Days of fasting are made less numerous for the new converts, but they are taught not to work on holy days of obligation. Boris is blamed for the cruelty he displayed towards certain of his rebellious pagan subjects; but "as he acted from zeal for the Christian religion, and from ignorance rather than from any malice, he will obtain forgiveness, on repentance, through the mercy of Christ."[2] Various superstitious practices are forbidden by the Pope. He bids them cease applying a certain stone to the sick for the purpose of bringing about restoration to health.[3] They are not to act on ideas got from opening books[4] at random, etc. He also gave a variety of answers all tending, if put into practice, to mitigate the warlike ferocity of the Bulgarians. They are to prepare for battle by prayer; their standard must in future be the cross, and not the tail of a horse. He always inculcated mercy, when he could not say that some of their strict laws relating to the conduct of their wars were absolutely unjust. It was their custom,[5] for instance, to put to death those who came to the field of battle with their equipment in an unsatisfactory condition. The Pope

[1] The office of the matrimonial coronation is given in Neale, *The Holy Eastern Church*, p. 1027 ff. This ceremony is at least as old as St. John Chrysostom, who speaks of it in his third homily on the third chapter of S. Paul's first epistle to Timothy.

[2] Resp. 17. [3] *Ib.*, 62. [4] *Ib.*, 77, 79, etc. [5] *Ib.*, 40.

would have them more careful of their spiritual equipment. Torture is not to be employed.

The pagans[1] are not to be converted by force. Polygamy is prohibited, the wife must be treated more as an equal, and sound rules are laid down with regard to continence[2] in married life. Bad priests cannot soil the Sacraments.

With regard to a patriarch for Bulgaria, as Boris evidently wanted civil and religious independence for his country, the return of the papal legates who would report on the progress made by Christianity in those parts, must be awaited. A bishop, however, will be sent to them at once; and, when the faith has spread, an archbishop, who must get his pall from Rome.[3] Those are the only true patriarchs who govern churches established by apostles, viz., those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The Sees of Jerusalem and Constantinople are not of the same rank (*auctoritatis*) as the former ones. No apostle founded the Church of Constantinople, nor is it mentioned by the Council of Nice. But because it was called the New Rome, its bishop has been called a patriarch rather by the favour of princes than by right.[4]

In conclusion, writes the Pope, you ask us to give you, like the other nations, Christianity without spot or wrinkle, inasmuch as you are much troubled by the contradictory utterances of Greeks, Armenians, etc. "In this matter we are sufficient of ourselves, our sufficiency is from God; and

[1] R. 41. "De iis autem qui Christianitatis bonum suscipere renuunt, nihil aliud scribere possumus vobis, nisi ut eos ad fidem rectam, monitis et ratione illos potius quam vi, quod vane sapiunt, convincatis. . . . Porro illis violentia, ut credant, nullatenus inferenda est." *Cf.* R. 102.

[2] R. 64, etc.

[3] R. 72, 73.

[4] Well does Nicholas here sum up the grounds of the claims of the patriarchs of Byzantium. "Quia Constantinopolis nova Roma dicta est, favore principum potius quam ratione, patriarcha ejus pontifex appellatus est." R. 92.

Blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his See, gives the true faith to those who seek for it."[1] The Roman Church, which is ever without spot, sends you men and books to teach you the truth. Until the roots of truth strike deep within you, we will not cease to water you. You are my joy and my crown.

The Pope's legates took along with them (866) a written code of laws[2] and books in addition to the *Responsa*. Such success attended the preaching of the missionaries sent by the Pope, that contemporary historians[3] speak as though the king and all his people were converted by them. So greatly did Boris become attached to the Romans, that we are told[4] that on one occasion, grasping his beard (*capillos suos*), he cried out, "Let all the nobles and people of the land of the Bulgarians know, that from henceforth, after God, I serve St. Peter and his Vicar."

Boris expelled all the other missionaries, and begged that Formosus, "a bishop in life and character," says the papal biographer, might be raised to the archiepiscopal dignity, and that more priests might be sent out to preach to his people. With great joy Nicholas commissioned (October 867) two more bishops and a number of carefully

[1] R. 106. "B. Petrus, qui in sede sua vivit et præsidet, dat quærentibus fidei veritatem."

[2] To this Nicholas frequently refers. *Cf.* RR. 13 and 19. For the books, R. 37.

[3] *Annal. Xant.*, ad an. 868. "Directis a Nicolao, ... viris apostolicis, receperunt (Bulgari) sermonem D. N. J. Christi, et baptizati sunt." Anastasius, in his preface to his translation of the eighth General Council, wrote even more explicitly: "Cum rex Vulgarorum cum propria gente Christi fidem suscepisset per hominem Romanum, id est, quemdam presbyterum Paulum nomine, documentum atque mysterium habuit a sede apostolica, non modo fidei regulam, sed et sanctæ legis sumere disciplinam," ap. Migne, t. 129, p. 18. *Cf.* p. 19; and *in vit. Nic.*

[4] *Ib.*, p. 20.

chosen priests to proceed to Bulgaria. Of these latter, he told Boris by letter that he might select one to be sent back to Rome to be consecrated archbishop, for he did not think that it was the right thing that the people who had been entrusted to the pastoral care of Formosus should lose their bishop.[1] Doubtless the fact was that the Pope objected to 'episcopal translations.' But, to all appearances at least, it would have been well for Formosus himself if he had been transferred to a Bulgarian See; and, as Boris was very much attached to him, Bulgaria might have been thus preserved in the unity of the Roman Church. Meanwhile he was destined by the Pope to go on an embassy to Constantinople in connection with the doings of Photius. Nicholas died (November 13, 867) before this second company of missionaries set out on their journey,[2] and he was spared the pain of seeing the fickle Bulgarian monarch veer round again, and throw himself finally into the arms of the patriarch of Constantinople.

Early ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria.

As we shall soon have to chronicle grave disputes between the popes and the patriarchs of Constantinople on the subject of jurisdiction over Bulgaria, we may here examine a little more closely the sources whence the Bulgarians first drew their Christianity, and to whom jurisdiction over the countries subdued by them originally belonged. Both Pope[3] and patriarch laid claim to priority of ecclesiastical rights over Bulgaria, and it would seem that each party had grounds for its pretensions, and that both the Latin and the Greek rite had exerted an influence in making Christians of the Bulgarians.

When, in the course of the seventh century, they established themselves in the triangle of territory formed by the

[1] Anast., *in vit.*, n. lxxiv. [2] *Ib.*, *in vit. Had. II.*

[3] The claims of the popes are admitted by d'Avril, *La Bulgarie Chrét.*, p. 2; and by Hore.

Dneister, the Danube, and the Theiss,[1] they found there, besides the Avars and the Slavs, no inconsiderable number of Daco-Romans, the descendants of the numerous colonists whom Trajan had poured into Dacia, and whom neither Goth, Hun, nor Avar had been able to exterminate. This curious Eastern-Latin race still dwells between the three rivers, is now independent, and proclaims its origin by the name (Roumania) it has given to a large tract of the country in which it was first formed. Though Dacia was separated from the Roman Empire in A.D. 270, the irrefragable testimony of the Roumanian language shows that it was through Latin agency that it first received the faith of Christ. "The fundamental ideas of Christianity are invariably expressed in the Roumanian language by words of Latin origin."[2] Though dominated for eight centuries by the Slavs and their ritual, the Roumanians have been but slightly influenced in their sacred terminology by them, and such ecclesiastical words as they borrowed from the Greeks only concern matters of secondary importance in religion. What is true as to the original source of Christianity in the country between the three rivers is true of the country between the Danube and the Balkans (known at the end of the sixth century as Moesia Inferior) which was overrun by Slavs in the seventh century, and was conquered and made their permanent home by the Bulgarians in the eighth century. Even during the pontificate of S. Leo I., the bishops of Moesia Inf. did not know Greek.[3] The Bulgarians must, therefore, have encountered the Latin rite as soon as they broke into Dacia, and the Greek rite at least when they took possession of Moesia. And when in the ninth century they

[1] That is, broadly speaking, the Dacia of Trajan.

[2] Xénopol, *Hist. des Roumains*, i. p. 135, Paris, 1896. *Cf.* pp. 137–140.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 140.

stretched away towards the West and South, and touched the empire of the Franks,[1] they must again have come in contact with Latin Christianity, and have thus a second time been influenced by it.

But the question of primitive ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria is not so easy to resolve. In a division of the Roman Empire made by Constantine the Great (306–337), the Balkan Peninsula was divided into Western and Eastern Illyricum. The latter then included Thrace, in which is situated the modern Bulgaria. But, in the year 314, Thrace was separated from Eastern Illyricum, and after that date was sometimes united to it, and sometimes divided from it. Now while it is certain that both Illyricums were under the patriarchal jurisdiction of Rome, that authority does not seem to have been organised there till Pope Damasus (366–384) established a vicar at Thessalonica; and it seems that at that date Thrace was separated from Eastern Illyricum.[2] Hence when in the days of Boris I. (852–888) Photius averred that ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Bulgarians belonged to him, his contention was so far just that, at least from the days of St. John Chrysostom, the patriarchs of Constantinople had held sway over the six provinces of Thrace[3] which embraced the modern Bulgaria. And it was there that

[1] *Ib.*, p. 133, quoting the Bavarian geographer of the end of the ninth century, who speaks of "the immense and populous country of the Bulgarians" as one of the regions which bound "our territories."

[2] *Cf.* vol. i., pt. i., p. 68 of this work, and the letterpress to Map 1. of Poole's *Historical Atlas*. In the lists of the Illyrian provinces given by Innocent I. (402–7), and by Nicholas I., over which they claimed jurisdiction, neither names Moesia Inferior or the modern Bulgaria. Yet J. M. Neale (*A Hist. of the Holy Eastern Ch.*, p. 44) asserts that in this very province "the Greek and Latin languages were used indiscriminately; and there was a considerable connection between the prelates and the See of Rome."

[3] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.*, v. 28. *Cf.* Pargoire, *L'église byzant.*, p. 54.

the Greeks first met the Bulgarians. But, by the time of Photius, the Bulgarian kingdom had spread far into Western Illyricum, and King Boris resided in Achrida. When Pope Nicholas, therefore, made the same assertion as Photius, his claim would seem to have had a broader foundation. But the whole question is obviously complicated, and the present writer cannot unravel it further.

S. Ansgar and his successor.

Nicholas was also watching with interest the good work which was still being done by St. Ansgar among the Scandinavians. Mention has already been made[1] of his bull, by which, owing to the burning of Hamburg by the Danes (845), he incorporated that See with the diocese of Bremen, and named Ansgar archbishop of the combined See. This he did (864) at the request of Louis the the German,[2] after he had learnt how matters stood from Solomon, bishop of Constance, sent to Rome by Louis, and from the priests who had been sent by Ansgar himself. In his bull[3] the Pope takes care to ordain that for the future the archbishop of Cologne, in whose diocese Bremen was originally comprised, was not to exercise any jurisdiction in the new diocese. The bull concludes by granting Ansgar the pallium on the usual conditions—"to wit,[4] that his successors, both in writing and on oath, proclaim, in person or by their envoys, that they are united with us in faith, that they receive the six holy synods, and the decrees of all the bishops of Rome; and that they will accept and put into execution the (apostolic) injunctions (*epistolæ*) which may be brought to them." Certain it is that Ansgar took the greatest care of the *privileges* which he received from the Apostolic See, and,

[1] Vol. ii., p. 220, n. of this work.

[2] *Vit. S. Anskarii*, c. 23.

[3] Ep. 62, p. 876 f.

[4] The bull, ap. *P. L.*, t. 119, p. 879. *Cf.* his letter (Ep. 61) to Louis the German.

moreover, had them copied and sent to nearly all the bishops of Louis the German.[1]

The same year (864) Nicholas wrote[2] to the Danish king Horic (or Eric), the Younger (854–888?), who, though not yet baptized, had "offered his vows to God and to Blessed Peter," to thank him for the presents he had sent him by bishop Solomon, and to exhort him to give up the worship of idols, which cannot help themselves, much less him. From some later authors it would seem that Horic followed the Pope's recommendations, and was baptized along with many of his people. With his predecessor, Eric I. (†854),[3] St. Ansgar had had a good understanding, for it was "upon the healthy admonitions of Ansgar that he had laid aside the errors of his impious heart, and had atoned for whatsoever he had done amiss in the insolence thereof."[4] During his reign, therefore, Christianity made substantial progress in Denmark; but his successor Eric II. was persuaded to act vigorously against it. In due course, however, through the instances of the Saint, Eric withdrew his opposition, and Christian churches were once again opened in his country.[5] But whether he himself became a Christian is very doubtful. At any rate, not long before his death, Ansgar was able to report to the bishops in Louis's kingdom that "the Church of Christ was established both among the Danes and the Swedes, and that priests perform their functions in those countries without let or hindrance."[6] On the death of the Apostle of the

[1] "Privilegia apostolicæ sedis, quæ erant de legatione ipsius facta, in multis libellis jussit describere," etc. *Vita*, c. 41.

[2] Ep. 63, p. 879. *Cf.* Ep. 61, n. 10.

[3] *Cf.* Prudentius, *Ann.*, 854 (*cf.* a. 850), ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. On his relations with Ansgar see *Vit. Ansch.*, cc. 24–26, 31, 32.

[4] *Saxo Grammaticus*, l. ix., Eng. trans., p. 384.

[5] *Vit. Ansch.*, cc. 31, 32.

[6] Ep. Ansgar., ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi. 163.

North (865), his biographer and companion, Rembert, was chosen to succeed him. He received[1] the pallium from Nicholas in December 865. Great must have been the consolation which the heroic work of these two kindred spirits brought to the Pope. He watched so carefully the beginnings of Christianity among the Slavs and Scandinavians, because it was his contention that his authority was requisite for the due founding of a new church. "If," he said,[2] "according *to the sacred decrees* a new basilica cannot be built without the sanction of the Pope, how can a church, *i.e.* a collection of Catholics, be instituted without the consent of the Apostolic See?"

Labours of Nicholas for the peace of Europe.

So far it may be said that we have not seen any intervention on the part of the Pope in the political affairs of the empire. The fact is that, speaking generally, he did not mingle in them at all. Affairs more strictly spiritual occupied his attention, and it has been well said in their regard that under Nicholas I. "the papacy entered upon the full possession of its primacy of jurisdiction, drawing and reserving to itself all important questions of ecclesiastical or moral interest, and thus preparing itself to play later on, at the full tide of the Middle Ages, a most splendid rôle, that of the most powerful mistress of souls which the world has ever seen."[3]

In the domain of politics, the efforts of Nicholas were confined to endeavours to promote the cause of peace. There was ever war either between Charles the Bald and Louis the German, or between each of those sovereigns and

[1] The bull, ap. *P. L. Ib.*, p. 962. "Scriptum . . . . in mense Decembre, ind. XIV."

[2] A fragment (Ep. 135, p. 1130): "Ecclesia, *i.e.* catholicorum collectio, quomodo sine apostolicæ sedis instituetur nutu, quando juxta sacra decreta nec ipsa debet absque præceptione papæ basilica noviter construi."

[3] *Jean VIII.*, by Lapôtre, p. vii.

their respective sons. In the first year of the pontificate of Nicholas, Louis, invoked by certain malcontents, invaded the territory of his brother. At first he carried all before him; but a reaction set in in favour of Charles, and Louis had to retreat to his own country. Anxious to clear himself in the eyes of the emperor (Louis II.) and of the Pope, he sent (859) Thioton, abbot of Fulda, into Italy, to exculpate him. In this mission Thioton was completely successful,[1] and returned with a letter from the Pope in his master's favour. Peace was concluded between the two sovereigns at Coblentz (860), where they took oaths of mutual fidelity "in accordance with the will of God and for the honour and defence of Holy Church."[2]

Two of the sons of Charles the Bald, viz., Louis and Charles, had given serious trouble to their father. In a letter[3] of 863, the Pope informs the rebellious sons that he was preparing to punish them when he heard from his legate, bishop Odo, that they had become reconciled to their father. He exhorts them not again to fall away from their duty to their parents. In conclusion, he commands them to be present at a council which he has ordered to assemble, and to submit to what shall be there decided concerning them. It may be noted, in passing, that if Nicholas was ready to admonish the sons of Charles to obey their father, he was equally prepared to point out to Charles himself (unless, indeed, the reference[4] by Hincmar

[1] *Annal. Fuld.*, ad ann. 858–9. [2] *Ib.*, 860. [3] Ep. 39.

[4] Ep. Synod. Carisiacensis, ap. Boretius, ii. 427 f. "Ab apostolica sede commonitus . . . . quæ perpere egit, correxerat." Another passage from this same letter, probably Hincmar's, is interesting as showing that the Franks regarded their kings as elected by the people, and were very proud that their election should be confirmed by the Pope. The letter speaks of the anointing of Charles the Bald, "consensu et voluntate populi regni istius" . . . . "quemque (Charles) sancta sedes apostolica mater nostra litteris apostolicis regem honorare studuit et confirmare."

and the bishops of the Council of Kiersy, 858, to the *Apostolic See* relates to some previous Pope) what he ought to amend in the maladministration of his kingdom.

In 865, the legate Arsenius was sent into 'France,' not only in connection with the divorce of Lothaire, but to renew[1] the peaceful understanding between Louis the German, and his nephews Louis, the emperor, and Lothaire, king of Lorraine. Two years later Nicholas has[2] to try to keep the sons of Louis the German in obedience to their father. The fruit of this incessant warfare between brothers, fathers, and sons might well be the anarchy of the tenth century.

Nicholas's letters the 'signs of the times.'

Many of Nicholas's letters and decrees—signs not only of the man but of the times—show that the approaching anarchy was already casting its black shadows before. They reveal to us[3] bishops at once youthful and vicious; priests the mere servants[4] of laymen; priests whose sacred character did not save them from being murdered; bishops[5] deposed from their Sees by lay nobles; the nobility,[6] on the one hand, plundering priests and people with impunity, and, on the other hand,[7] bishops recklessly scattering abroad excommunications. The letters of Nicholas show also that the long and severe canonical penances, so characteristic of the earlier centuries of the Church, were still in vogue, though they were somewhat modified in their severity by him. On a certain monk who had killed another, Nicholas imposed[8] a penance of twelve years' duration. The penitent was to pass the first three years in sorrow at the door of the church, the next two among the 'auditors' (*auditores*),

[1] *An. Fuld.*, ad an. 865. "Ob pacem et concordiam renovandam missus est (Arsenius) in Franciam."

[2] *Ib.*, ad an. 867. [3] Ep. 127.

[4] Ep. 81, an abuse to which Nicholas intended to put an end.

[5] Ep. 24. [6] Epp. 88 and 111. [7] Ep. 118.

[8] Ep. 119. *Cf.* Epp. 122, 136, etc.

but was not to be allowed to receive Holy Communion. During the last seven he was to be allowed to communicate on the great feasts, but was not to be permitted to make any offerings for use in the sacrifice. Throughout the whole twelve years, except on Sundays and great festivals, he was to fast till evening, as in Lent. If he undertook a journey, it was to be on foot. Nicholas declared that had it not been for the faith displayed by the monk, and for his respect for the holy apostles Peter and Paul, whose protection he had come to Rome to implore, he would have had to impose a lifelong penance upon him.

Public works.

Whether there was less to be done after the labours of his predecessors in this direction, or whether Nicholas had less taste or leisure for work of the sort, it is certain that he did not spend so much time and money on public buildings as the popes who had immediately gone before him. Still, his biographer has to record not a few of the Pope's gifts to different churches and many of his building operations. Among his most important undertakings in the latter department was the repairing of the *Tocia, i.e. Jocia*, and the Trajana or Sabatina aqueducts. The former, the locality of which was at one time unknown, had, we are told, long been out of repair.[1] The old reading *Tocia* had concealed its identity, but the restoration of the reading *Jocia* has enabled Duchesne to identify it with the Jobia or Jovia aqueduct. It is often mentioned in the eighth and ninth centuries, and is the one which, passing over the arch of Drusus, near the Porta Appia (now the Porta S. Sebastiano), was carried towards the Circus Maximus and struck the Tiber near the Greek Quarter (*schola*), with its Church of S. Maria in Cosmedin. The learned abbé suggests, as we have already seen,[2] that the restoration of

[1] *L. P.*, n. xvi.

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 5, n. *Cf.* vol. i., pt. ii., p. 483 of this work.

this aqueduct may well have been in connection with the great hospice which Nicholas attached to that church.

The Trajana aqueduct had already been repaired by Gregory IV. Damaged, perhaps, by the Saracens, it was both repaired and improved under[1] the personal supervision of Nicholas, especially for the benefit of the poorer pilgrims who flocked to Rome. Kept in order by successive popes; it enters Rome on the Janiculum, and supplies the fountains in front of St. Peter's and much of the Trastevere.[2] Nicholas also refortified Ostia, and placed in it a strong garrison.

Like his immediate predecessors, he also endeavoured to make good the damage done to St. Peter's by "the devastation of the Saracens."[3] He adorned with frescos the *new* S. Maria Antiqua,[4] and added still another building to the already very complex structure of the Lateran palace.[5] It is most interesting to find that the fame of Nicholas had attracted some of our countrymen to Rome, and that too, despite their difficulties at home from the Danes, and that they helped him to decorate churches. Mindful of the great Pope from whom they had received the light of Christianity, we find these grateful Englishmen erecting a silver tablet in the little chapel of St. Gregory, which they found, not, as the old editions of the *Liber Pontificalis* say, in the church dedicated to St. Peter at 'Frascata,' but in the basilica of the Prince of the Apostles at Rome.[6]

Promis only knows of two silver coins of Nicholas. Coins.
Both bear on the obverse the names of the Pope and St. Peter, and on the reverse 'Roma,' with, in one case, the

[1] *L. P.*, n. lxvi. "Minime corpori suo parcens."
[2] Murray's *Hand-book for Rome*, p. 49 of introduction, and vol. i., *l. c.*, of this work.
[3] *L. P.*, n. lxxix.
[4] *Ib.*, n. xxxvii., and vol. i., *l. c.*, p. 121, 122 of this work.
[5] *Ib.*, n. lxxxi. [6] *L. P.*, n. liv.

addition of 'Ludovvicus Imp.' He believes there is some mistake in connection with a supposed half-denarius, mentioned by Cinagli.

To those who desire to know more of Nicholas, we must, with Anastasius, commend the perusal of his weighty letters.[1] For if we desired to record all he did, "paper rather than material" would fail us.

Nicholas not an innovator.

With the great deeds and words of Nicholas before them, the party cry of the *False Decretals* ringing in their ears, and the doings of earlier pontiffs not clearly in their minds, many authors write as though, under Nicholas, the See of Rome had exercised in the Church powers essentially higher than it had before. It is said that Nicholas asserted a new primacy over the bishops of the Christian world, and arrogated to himself new rights as teacher and as absolute ruler of the Universal Church.

It may be at once conceded that, with the development of the Church in general, and of the churches in the West in particular, on the one hand, and the growing anarchy there on the other, and with the increasing manifestation of the tendency of the East to slip away from the grasp of the popes, the intervention of Nicholas in ecclesiastical affairs generally all over the world was more frequent than that of his predecessors. But that interference was imperatively called for. And just as Gregory I. took upon himself more temporal responsibility than the popes who had gone before him, because the disordered state of the times in Italy required a firm hand—and apart from his there was none—so Nicholas I. did the same in the spiritual and temporal orders in the larger field of the whole Catholic world. If he proclaimed nothing new, advanced no fresh pretension, his remarkable energy in applying

[1] *Ib.*, n. lxxvii. "Quas bene libratas per mundi partes direxit, luce clarius."

received principles to concrete cases resulted in a much wider *recognition* of the Pope's supreme spiritual jurisdiction in the Church. If he enunciated nothing new, he no doubt gave a further expansion to admitted principles, and pushed further home conclusions already granted.

On him kings, like other Christians, were dependent in the spiritual order. For they are but men after all; and all men had been ordered by Our Lord to hear the Church. And this truth Nicholas did not fail to express in his letters. In his famous letter to the emperor Michael he writes: "By the power of God we have been born the sons (and heirs) of the apostles Peter and Paul; and, though in merit far beneath them, we have been constituted princes over all the earth, *i.e.* over the Universal Church; for the earth here means the Church."[1] And it is only fair to add that the position of Nicholas was as much recognised by the kings themselves as claimed by him. In a letter to Nicholas, already quoted, the emperors Louis II. and Lothaire proclaim him their spiritual father and profess themselves his sons. "No one," they write, "more fully and ardently desires the prosperity of your apostleship than do we both who love you; who, as spiritual and most devoted sons, embrace your loving paternity with all the affection of our hearts . . . . and who with mind and heart humbly commend ourselves to your holy paternity . . . . since the apostle says—'All power comes from God.'"[2]

But with all this, it must not be thought that Nicholas either claimed or exercised any powers which his pre- Gregory I. and Nicholas I.

[1] "Pro quibus patribus (Peter and Paul) nos divinitus . . . . nati sumus filii, et constituti, licet eis longe meritis impares, *principes* super omnem terram, id est, super universam Ecclesiam. Terra enim Ecclesia dicitur." Ep. 86, p. 949. *Cf.* Ep. 65, p. 882. In Ep. 29, p. 815, Nicholas says that St. Peter "nobis *singulari prærogativa*, ut in totius Christianæ religionis universitate *principaliter* excelleremus, contulit."

[2] Ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi. 212. Other similar letters are quoted by Roy, pp. 133, 134, French ed.

decessors had not. The growth of the papal power in the Church was as natural as the increasing exercise of reason with the gradual development of the human frame. To bring out the truth of this assertion, we may conveniently turn for purposes of comparison to Gregory the Great. And that, not because earlier pontiffs cannot be cited in this connection, but because he was the first Pope treated of in this work.

Like his great predecessor, Nicholas always grounds his claims on the three memorable[1] texts—Thou art Peter (Matt. xvi. 18), Confirm thy brethren (Luke xxii. 32), Feed my lambs, Feed my sheep (John xxi. 15),—on precedent, viz., on what had been said and done by his predecessors, and, lastly, on what the Fathers and the Councils had said of the power and prerogatives of the popes.

We may descend to a few particulars. If Nicholas declared he was head of the Church, and thus above all bishops, Gregory had made the same assertion over and over again. Speaking of the See which put forth the greatest pretensions, as well as in his days as in those of Nicholas, Gregory writes[2]: "As to what they say concerning the Church of Constantinople, who doubts that it is *subject to the Apostolic See*? This is constantly acknowledged (*adsidue profitentur*) by our most pious lord the emperor and our brother the bishop of the same city. Still, if that or any other Church has anything good, I am ready to imitate my *inferiors* (*minores*) in good, whilst at the same time I keep them from what is not right. For a fool is he who thinks that he shows his *primacy* when he considers it beneath him

[1] *Cf.* Gregor., Epp., vii. 37 (40), where he quotes the three texts together, and says that, in his successors, Peter still occupies his chair, and that the Church is founded "on the solidity of the Prince of the Apostles."

[2] Ep. (ed. *M. G. Epp.*, as usual), ix. 26 (12).

to copy any good he may see." And, speaking not merely of one See, however important, but of the whole Church, Gregory lays down[1] that the care of all of it has been entrusted to him, that he is the shepherd of the whole flock of Christ, and that the Apostolic See is the head of all the churches.

If Nicholas claimed[2] a right of censorship over books which treated of the faith, and declared that "the Roman[3] Church confirmed councils by its authority . . . . and that certain councils were without authority because they had never received the assent of the Roman pontiffs"—we find Gregory declaring that he has forbidden the reading of a book, because he found therein "manifest poison of heretical infection," and that a synod "would have no force without the authority and consent of the Apostolic See."[4] And if we find Nicholas resisting emperors and patriarchs, did not Gregory resist Maurice, and John the Faster? The altered conditions of his temporal position are enough to

[1] V. 37 (20). Quoting *the three* texts, he says all know that to Peter "totius ecclesiæ cura commissa est," and then a little lower down he repeats, "Cura ei (Peter) totius ecclesiæ et *principatus* committitur."

"Unde oportet ita nos caulas ovium, quibus nos *custodes* videmur esse *præpositi*, vigilanti sollicitudine præmunire, quatenus," etc., iv. 35.

Sedes apostolica "quæ omnium ecclesiarum caput est," xiii. 50 (45). Gregory, or his predecessor, Pelagius II., in Ep. "Virtutum mater," c. an. 586, speaks of the Roman See "quæ a cuncta ecclesia humiliter in ejus auctore veneratur."

[2] He told (Ep. 115, p. 1119) Charles the Bald, that the translation of Denis the Areopagite, by John Scotus Erigena, ought to have been sent to him. "Quod *juxta* morem nobis mitti et nostro debuit judicio approbari . . . . quatenus ab omnibus incunctanter nostra auctoritate acceptius habeatur."

[3] Ep. 86, p. 947. *Cf.* Ep. 65, p. 882. "Sine cujus (the Apostolic See) consensu nulla concilia vel accepta esse leguntur." Hincmar, *De divortio Lothar.*, resp. ad quæst., ii., ap. *P. L.*, t. 125, says exactly the same.

[4] On the book, Ep. vi. 62 (66); on the authority of councils, "Quamvis sine apostolicæ sedis auctoritate atque consensu, nullas, quæque (in synodo) acta fuerint vires habeant," ix. 156 (68).

explain the greater force and freedom of the tone of Nicholas to the kings of the earth. Lastly, if to the assertions of Gregory already quoted, we add that, when he nominated vicars in any part of the Church, he took care[1] to let them know that he reserved the more important cases (*causæ majores*) to himself, Nicholas will not be thought to have claimed for the Roman Church more than Gregory, when he said: "It is for the Apostolic See to judge metropolitans, whose causes have always been reserved to it; moreover, it has been its wont to condemn or absolve patriarchs, as the case may be; and it has been its acknowledged (*jus*) and inherent (*fas*) right to judge all priests, inasmuch as it belongs to it by special prerogative to make laws, issue decrees, and promulgate decisions throughout the whole Church."[2]

In referring the reader for the further development of these points to the second part of Roy's biography, it may in fine be noted that, if Nicholas *seems* to exercise more legislative, judicial, and executive authority in the Church than did Gregory I., and that if he himself seems to be eclipsed in this by Gregory VII., there can be no doubt that the conclusions, drawn from the increased study of canon law from this century onwards, did but justify their action. The more the position of the Pope in the Church was studied, whether in the domain of theology or canon law, the more fully was acknowledged his dogmatic supremacy on the one hand and his legislative and executive authority on the other. It must, moreover, be remembered that both theologians and canon lawyers

[1] In appointing, ii. 8 (7) Maximianus his vicar in Sicily, Gregory writes: "Ut sublevati de minimis in causis majoribus efficacius occupemur." Virgilius of Arles is also instructed to refer matters of faith, and important matters generally, to him, "quatenus a nobis valeat congrua *sine dubio* sententia terminari." Ep. v. 59 (54).

[2] Ep. 65, p. 882.

always maintained that what they set down as the rights of the Pope in their particular age were legitimate conclusions from the words of Our Lord to St. Peter, and from the position of the Pope in the Church, and had, moreover, at least in some primitive way, been exercised by the popes of preceding ages. And contrary to the *direct* temporal influence of the Pope in the affairs of this world, which, beginning in the twelfth century, reached its climax from the days of Innocent III. to Boniface VIII., and then began to decline, contrary, we say, to this temporal influence, the spiritual prerogatives of the Pope in the Church have gone on steadily developing to this present hour. The great temporal influence of the papacy was seemingly brought about by divine providence for the benefit of the rising nations of Europe, which were brought up under the parental guidance of the popes. It ceased when the nations were able to stand by themselves and were no longer in need of it, or, may be, were no longer worthy of it. But the spiritual position of the popes was for the advantage of God's Church, and as that, in the belief of Catholics, is to last for ever, so will papal pre-eminence, they hold, endure powerfully to the end of time.

"Even the spiritual supremacy arrogated by the Pope," says Macaulay,[1] "was in the dark ages productive of far more good than evil. Its effect was to unite the nations of Western Europe into one great commonwealth. What the Olympian chariot course and the Pythian oracle were to all the Greek cities from Trebizond to Marseilles, Rome and her bishop were to all Christians of the Latin communion from Calabria to the Hebrides. Thus grew up sentiments of enlarged benevolence. Nations separated from each other by seas and mountains acknowledged a fraternal tie and a common code of public law. Even

[1] *Hist. of Eng.*, I., c. i., p. 7, ed. 1866.

in war the cruelty of the conqueror was not seldom mitigated by the recollection that he and his vanquished enemies were all members of one great federation."

Death of Nicholas, 867.

Nicholas died November 13, 867, and we are assured by his biographer that not only did all men long bewail his loss, but the heavens themselves long shed tears thereat. He was buried "before the gates of St. Peter's."[1]

Writing[2] to Ado, archbishop of Vienne, Anastasius earnestly begs him to pray for Nicholas. "Alas!" he writes, "how late was the Church in meriting so noble a man and how soon in losing him." In the Roman martyrology mention is made of Nicholas as "vigore apostolico præstantis" (November 13), and his successor Hadrian II. speaks[3] of him as a "new star appearing amidst the clouds of this life, and as one who, under God, by the brightness of his life and learning, drove away the darkness of error, and who by word and example showed not only

[1] According to the Chronicle of Ado (*M.G. SS.*, ii.) Nicholas was buried in the porch (*atrium*) before the gates of St. Peter, near his predecessor. A fragment of his epitaph is still to be seen in the crypts of St. Peter's:

"Conditur hoc antro sacri substantia carnis
Præsulis egregii Nicolai, dogmate sancto
Qui fulsit cunctis mundum replevit et orbem
. . . . . .
Quæ docuit verbis, actuque peregit opimo."

Etc., ap. Duchesne, *L. P.*, ii. 172, or Dufresne, *Les Cryptes Vaticanes*, p. 49, where there is an illustration of the fragment. Completed from a transcription made by Peter Mallius, and with the aid of certain conjectural restorations, the epitaph tells the enquirer who, from the East or West, the South or the frozen North, comes to know why men are sad, that beneath this tomb are the sacred remains of that most excellent prelate Nicholas, who, illustrious for his holy teaching, filled all the earth with it. Distinguished for his purity, he was the best example of his own teaching. Full of heavenly wisdom, may he shine for ever in the courts of heaven with those glories which belong to noble teachers!

[2] Ep. ap. Migne, t. 129, p. 741.

[3] Ep. 12, ap. *P. L.*, or Labbe, viii. p. 939.

what ought to be condemned, but what ought to be imitated."

The *False Decretals.*

It will not be expected that we should leave Nicholas I. without saying something about the famous *False Decretals*, inasmuch as Nicholas is said by some to have fortified his pretensions by citations from these documents. From the writings of a certain class of authors, it would seem that there are men credulous enough to believe that the power and position of the popes in the Church from the Middle Ages onwards rests solely on a collection of forged letters. Others, who do not go quite so far as this, still imagine that at least much of their authority came from the *False Decretals*. The fact is that, at the very most, the work of "Isidore Mercator" only quickened the development of the exercise of the power of the popes in the details of the government of the Church. It is now indeed acknowledged by many non-Catholic writers that the influence of the Pseudo-Isidorian decrees on the growth of the authority of the popes in the Church has been much exaggerated. "It will be seen," says Mr. Wells,[1] "that the influence of the *Forged Decretals*, based on a misconception of their contents and history, has been very much over-estimated." They introduced nothing at all *new*, and consequently caused no radical change in the internal life of the Church. They may have caused a comparatively rapid evolution of ecclesiastical discipline in some directions, but the development was a real growth of what already pre-existed. Just as divers new conditions

[1] *The Age of Charlemagne*, p. 450. This work is perhaps the best of the rather wordy and superficial American series of *Eras of the Christian Church*. Mr. Wells closely follows the conclusions of Paul Hinschius, equally a non-Catholic, and the latest and best editor of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. Mr. Wells is here cited, as his book is no doubt more accessible to the general reader than the great work of Hinschius.

often result in a rapid and sometimes uneven, though quite natural, development of different parts of the human frame, the *Forged Decretals* perhaps precipitated a further centralisation in the government of the Church; for instance, by bringing under the *causæ majores* all that concerned the deposition of bishops.[1] But as has been said, "they were only an expression of the principles and tendency (and, it might have been added, of the wants) of the age; and things would have gone just the same (or practically the same) if they had never existed."

It is allowed that the *False Decretals* were not known to Nicholas I. till 864. We shall show that whenever they were first brought to his notice,[2] they were never used by him.[3] If the acts of the popes from Gregory I. till that epoch be compared with the doings of the popes after that date, it will be at once seen that nothing was done in the latter period which was not done in the former. The same things were practised as before, but perhaps more frequently. It was precisely because no *new* principle was set forth in the *False Decretals* that they were so readily and unquestionably received. Had they inculcated a brand new set of doctrines with regard to Church government, they could no more have been unquestionably accepted all over the Christian world for hundreds of years, than could a Civil Code containing an important body of new and

[1] *Cf.* Hinschius, p. ccxiv.

[2] Lupus of Ferrières consulted him about one of the documents (a decree of Pope Melchiades) of the collection in 858. *Cf.* Ep. Lupi 5, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi. 114. It is believed that Rothad brought them to Rome in 864. *Cf.* Hinschius, p. ccvii.

[3] This is conceded by Hinschius (*l. c.*). De Smedt shows (pp. 16, 17) that, contrary to the idea of Hinschius, Nicholas did not interpret the genuine decrees he quotes in the sense of the False Decretals, but perfectly logically *Les Fausses Décrétales*, Paris, 1870, an extract from *Les Études relig.*

unauthorised laws be foisted without indignant protest upon a particular country.

Before the collection of 'Isidore Mercator,' several other collections of canons had been made and circulated in different parts of the Church. Of the earlier collections, the one in most repute was that made by the monk Dionysius the Little, at Rome, in the beginning of the sixth century. It consisted of the canons of various councils and a number of decretal letters of the Popes, from S. Siricius (385) to Anastasius II. (498). This had an extensive circulation and was well known to the Franks, as Pope Hadrian I. had sent it to Charlemagne. Another collection, also well known to them, was one that had been made in Spain, and was ascribed to S. Isidore of Seville (636). Early collections of canons.

But about the middle of the ninth century there appeared in France no less than three spurious collections, viz., the short one known as the *Capitula Angilramni*, which professed to be a set of canons given by Pope Hadrian I. to Angelramn, bishop of Metz. In some copies,[1] indeed, of this work it is said that it was presented by the bishop to the Pope. This collection consists of some seventy short chapters, mostly dealing with questions of ecclesiastical judicial procedure. Then we have the *Capitularies* of Benedict Levita,[2] who professed to have drawn them from the archives of Mayence, when he was a deacon there under archbishop Otgar. The work of Benedict is divided into three books, in each of which are over four hundred articles on different subjects.[3]

Lastly, there is the collection known as that of Isidore Mercator.[4] In the preface to his work 'Isidore' says that he has been forced by bishops and others to collect together The Decretals of Isidore.

[1] Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs*, xii. p. 133.
[2] Ap. *M. G. LL.*, iii., or *P. L.*, t. 97.
[3] Ceillier, *ib.*, 395.
[4] One or two MSS. give 'Peccator' or the Sinner.

the various canons.[1] Of the three parts of which the collection is made up, the first contains the preface, a letter to and one from Pope Damasus (366–384), in which latter the Pope professes to comply with a request contained in the former for the decrees of the Popes up to his own time. We have also in this first part the so-called Apostolic Canons, some sixty forged Decretals of the Popes from S. Clement to S. Melchiades (311–314) and the false Donation of Constantine. The second part gives the Acts of the Councils, from that of Nice to that of the Second Council of Seville (619), for the most part already edited. The third part consists of Decretals of Popes from St. Silvester to Gregory II., of which some forty are forgeries.

Besides treating of the primacy and other prerogatives and privileges of the Roman See and of bishops, in their various relations to the secular power, to their metropolitans, etc., it is important to remember that the documents in this collection treat of matters theological, liturgical, and penitential. Though forgeries, these decretals "are[2] nevertheless, in matter of fact, the real utterances of Popes, though not of those to whom they are ascribed; and hence the forgery is, on the whole, one of chronological location, and does not affect their essential character."

With regard to these three collections, the truth is that there is but little definitely known about them. Of the chronological sequence of their production, of their author or authors, of the exact year of their issue, there is no certainty. It is, however, highly probable that they were manufactured in France about the middle of the ninth

[1] "Compellor a multis tam episcopis quam reliquis servis Dei canonum sententias colligere et uno in volumine redigere et de multis unum facere." Pg. 17, ed. Hinschius.

[2] Alzog, *Church Hist.*, ii. p. 195.

century.[1] They may easily have been the work of one man; of a man whom the works themselves show to have been working for a good end, with a good motive, but, of course, with reprehensible ideas of his own concerning literary honesty.

By degrees the work of Isidore Mercator, which was popularly supposed to be the production of St. Isidore of Seville, and which from its first appearance was at once accepted in France,[2] practically ousted the other collections altogether, and was for centuries *the* collection of canons which was cited, both by councils and by individuals. Centuries also elapsed before any suspicion [3] was entertained that the decretals therein contained were not genuine in every respect. There can be no doubt that the principal reason of this their ready acceptance was the fact that there was nothing in them out of harmony with the religious and ecclesiastical ideas of the age in which they made their first appearance. There was nothing in them to *provoke* suspicion. Had they manifested any general substantial clashing with the views of the period on the hierarchy, etc., they

[1] And, as far as the Isidorian decrees are concerned, in the diocese of Rheims. Hinschius (p. clxxxii) thinks that Benedict's work appeared first, and that the other two are the work of one author.

[2] They were alluded to in the Council of Soissons in 853, and definitely cited in the Councils of Quiercy-sur-Oise (857), of Fimes (in the diocese of Rheims, 881, can. 5), of Metz, 889, and others before the end of the ninth century. De Smedt, *l. c.*, pp. 5 and 11. They were also received by the founders of Canon Law in France, Regino of Prum, and Burchard of Worms.

[3] It has been said that their authenticity was called in question by Hincmar. On the contrary, they were cited by him in his treatise *of fifty-five chapters* against Hincmar of Leon, and in that on the divorce of Lothaire, etc. De Smedt, pp. 5 and 6. He once cast doubts on the *preface* of the collection, and on the introductory letter of Pope Damasus (*ib.*); and when they were used against him, contended that the papal decrees therein quoted, or rather some of them, only dealt with questions of the hour, and were not authoritative because they had not been accepted by councils, but not because they were unauthentic.

would never have been received without a searching investigation. New laws cannot be imposed on men, especially on ecclesiastics, without causing a considerable amount of *sensation*. And if the *False Decretals* of Isidore had been, as many would seem to believe they were, a collection of canons which imposed new obligations and created new privileges, it is certain that their claim to general acceptance would have been thoroughly investigated. But as they seemed to men simply to focus already more or less clearly received notions, they were readily accepted for what they professed to be. About the middle of the fifteenth century, however, they were definitely pronounced spurious by Cardinal Nicholas de Cusa,[1] who was as great a critic in the domain of physical science as in that of literature. His verdict has been generally accepted since by writers of all creeds.

The object of the decrees.

It has been most reasonably suggested that the state of the times was the cause of the publication of the *False Isidore*[2]; and that, consequently, we must look therein for the cue as to the aim and object of the author of the *Forged Decretals*. The wars between Louis and his sons, and afterwards between these sons themselves, or again between them and their sons, which permitted of incursions with impunity of Norman, Saracen, and Slav, and of the multiplication of petty tyrants, were resulting in the decay of all order. In the midst of the growing civil anarchy, the Church, too, in the Carolingian empire was suffering in a corresponding manner. On the one hand, she was in trouble from without. Her property was being seized by powerful nobles, and the freedom of her elections interfered with. From within also was the Church in difficulties. In

[1] *De Concordia Catholica*, iii. c. 2, cited by Jungmann, whose excellent dissertation, *De Decretalibus Pseudo-Isidorianis*, we have used freely.

[2] "Apparet Pseudo-Isidorum in figmentis suis compilandis conditionem ecclesiasticam suæ aetatis respexisse." Hinschius, p. ccxxviii.

imitation of the higher secular nobility, the greater ecclesiastics endeavoured to arrogate power to themselves, to the detriment of the rights of others beneath them. And their ambition was favoured by the temporal rulers who with good reason imagined that they could the more easily get the whole of the episcopate under their control, if once the latter were brought well within the grasp of one or two metropolitans, upon whom it would not be difficult for them to keep their iron hands. The natural remedy in the case of the civil disorder would have been a strong imperial power; and in the ecclesiastical, the constant action of a strong central authority. In the ecclesiastical order, as in the civil, there was a recognised central authority —that of the bishops of Rome. *One* of the aims of the *False Decretals* was to bring that power into more constant action. In the civil order, to check oppression on the part of local authority, there was needed a ready means of appeal to a direct and less local representative of the central government. With the strength of a Charlemagne behind them, this want had been well supplied by his *missi dominici*. In ecclesiastical affairs the papal vicars were destined to serve the same ends. The chief[1] aim, therefore,

[1] After quoting various passages from the Pseudo-Isidore, Mr. Wells (p. 439) adds: "It will be readily seen that the author's main object was to free the clergy from the secular power, and to establish the hierarchy, maintaining the co-equal authority of all bishops, though they might differ in importance; placing the Roman See at the head, possessing all power and authority, derived, not as the others, from the apostles, but from Christ himself, through St. Peter, whom He had appointed, and whom the other apostles acknowledged as their chief." *Cf.* Hinschius, *l. c.*; Fournier, *Étude sur les Fausses Décrétales*, ap. *Revue d'hist. eccls.*, Jan. 1906, p. 33 ff. On p. 43 there is the following very accurate remark: "The *False Decretals* would never have been drawn up in the terms in which they have come down to us, had not the Holy See, at the time in which they were put together, been in possession of a power the aid of which was necessary to assure the proper independence of the Church in the Frankish Empire."

of the *Pseudo-Isidore* was, by the appeal to very remote antiquity, to bring about the more ready acceptance of such legislation as would naturally result in freeing the clergy from metropolitan or lay oppression.

The exaltation of the Roman See not the principal aim of the *False Decretals*.

The principal end, therefore, of the author of the *Forged Decretals* was not—contrary to what apparently many seem anxious to believe—the exaltation of the See of Rome. On this point we will use no words of our own, but leave the field to a non-Catholic writer.[1]

"It has been said sometimes, and it is supposed quite generally, that the main object of the *Decretals* was to enhance the supremacy of Rome, but this view is now given up by all the best and most recent scholars.

"In the first place, most of the arguments for it have been directly disproved. The *Forged Decretals* were not composed by the Popes, nor written at Rome. They were not first known to the Popes, nor first used by the Popes; indeed, they were used very little by the Popes until after the tenth century, when they had become incorporated into the general ecclesiastical legislation. . . . . The position given to the primates and the mere mention of papal vicars in only four places are regarded by Hinschius and others as showing that *Pseudo-Isidore* was more intent on freeing the bishops[2] from the metropolitans than on extending the power of the Popes."[3]

The *Forged Decretals* not used by the Popes till Leo IX., 1049–1055.

The author of this straightforward passage remarks

[1] Mr. Wells, *The Age of Charlemagne*, p. 447 f.

[2] Hence the authorship of the *False Decretals* has been recently ascribed to Aldric, bishop of Mans.

[3] Whatever was the chief end the *Pseudo-Isidore* had in view, it is certain that he did not attempt to treat of all matters ecclesiastical. "Id saltem concedendum est," says their careful editor Hinschius (p. ccxxviii), "Pseudo-Isidorum imaginem totius status ecclesiastici omnibus in rebus reformandi decretalibus suis non expressisse," etc. With this contrast the exaggerated description of Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 192.

therein that the *False Decretals* "were used very little by the Popes until after the tenth century." It is more than doubtful if they were used by any Pope before Leo IX., except once by Hadrian II., on a matter of no importance. It has indeed been said that they were used by Nicholas I. Of their existence he was in all likelihood aware, but he did not himself[1] use them. Against this latter assertion it is urged particularly that Nicholas, in asserting that bishops could not be condemned without reference to the Holy See, and that councils must receive papal sanction, introduced a new discipline into the Church, and was in fact relying on the *False Decretals*. Taking these two points in detail, it is to be observed that if, as is generally agreed, Nicholas did not know of the existence of the *False Decretals* till 864, he could not have been resting on them when in 862 he wrote[2] that it was "by the authority and sanction of the bishops of the first See of the Roman Church that all synods and councils were confirmed." And even if Nicholas had known of the existence of the *False Decretals* when he penned that letter to Photius, it had long ago been laid down, in a genuine epistle[3] of Pope S. Gelasius I. (492–6), that it is "by the authority of the Apostolic See that every synod is confirmed," and we are told by the Byzantine historian Socrates (ii. 17)[4] that Pope

[1] This, according to Ceillier, was conceded by the Protestant writer Blondel (*Pseudo-Isid.*, Prol., c. 19), who in the early part of the eighteenth century refuted the Jesuit Turrianus, who made a last stand to defend the authenticity of the *Isidorian Decretals*. It is conceded also by Hinschius.

[2] Ep. 12 ad Photium (Migne, p. 788), "Decretalia autem, quæ a sanctis pontificibus primæ sedis Romanæ ecclesiæ sunt instituta, cujus auctoritate atque sanctione omnes synodi et sancta concilia roborentur et stabilitatem sumunt, cur vos non habere vel observare dicitis?"

[3] Ep. ad epp. Dardan. "Quæ (Sedes Ap.) et unamquamque synodum sua auctoritate confirmat et continua moderatione custodit."

[4] *Cf.* Sozomen, iii. 10, and Julius's own letter to the Eusebians, n. 22, ed. Coustant, p. 386.

Julius (341–352) reminded a number of bishops that, "by ecclesiastical law, no decisions of the churches are valid unless sanctioned by the bishop of Rome."

Again, if, in 865, in a letter[1] famous in this matter of the *Decretals*, Nicholas affirmed that "more important matters" were to be referred to the Apostolic See, and that among such *causæ majores* the condemnation of bishops must of a certainty be reckoned, not only had he himself already (863) asserted[2] this, but S. Innocent I. (402–417) had centuries before laid[3] down "that the more important causes were to be referred to the Apostolic See, after the decision of the bishops had been given, in accordance with the synodal decrees and custom."[4] And if it be remembered that it is the belief of the Catholic Church that bishops have received a divine commission to rule the churches of God, and that they are regarded by her as the depositaries and organs of the faith, it would certainly seem no more than a natural development that what concerns their status should in process of time tend more and more to come under the immediate cognisance of her head.

Besides, if we look to ancient custom, we find fourth-century Greek historians assuring us that, when Pope Julius restored Paul of Constantinople and other Eastern

[1] Ep. 75 ad epp. Galliæ, *P.L.*, p. 899 f.

[2] Ep. 35 ad epp. Suess., *P.L.*, p. 826 f.

[3] Ep. 2, n. 3, to Victricius, bishop of Rouen, "Si majores causæ in medium fuerint devolutæ, ad Sedem Apost. sicut synodus statuit, et beata consuetudo exigit, post judicium episcopale referantur."

[4] How clearly is all this stated by Hincmar in the preface to his treatise on such a dogmatic subject as divorce: "De omnibus dubiis vel obscuris quæ ad rectæ fidei tenorem vel pietatis dogmata pertinent, sancta Romana ecclesia, ut omnium Ecclesiarum mater et magistra . . . . est consulenda, et ejus salubria monita sunt tenenda, maxime ab his (referring to the Pope as Patriarch of the West) qui in illis regionibus habitant, in quibus divina gratia per ejus predicationem omnes in fide genuit." *Præfat. in divort. Loth.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 125.

bishops to their sees, he did so in virtue "of the peculiar privileges" or "prerogative" of the Church of Rome[1]—a superior authority recognised as theirs even by the contemporary pagan historian Ammianus Marcellinus.[2]

It is in the letter[3] to "all the bishops of Gaul" (865) that Nicholas says most about decretals. In it he shows that he evidently has in his mind two sets of papal documents, one a 'codified' collection, and the other consisting of the decrees of Popes as he found them in the papal archives.[4] It is also evident that the latter collection was regarded by him as of equal importance, but that it was to the codified collection that an effort was being made to restrain him by those concerning whom he was writing, and who had objected to receiving certain decretals because they were not in their code. And their code was that of Dionysius the Little. At least it was supposed to be.[5] If, argued Nicholas, papal decrees were not to be received[6] which were not in the collection of the canons, then not only could neither the decrees of S. Gregory I. nor of many another Pope be accepted, but not even the Scriptures themselves, since they had never been inserted in any code of ecclesiastical canons. But, concludes Nicholas, the papal decrees must be received

[1] Socrates, *H. E.*, ii. 15. *Cf.* Sozomen, iii. 7.

[2] L. 15, n. 7.

[3] Ep. 75.

[4] *Ib.* "Quæ (decretalia constituta, opuscula) . . . . penes se (Romana Ecclesia) in suis archivis et vetustis rite monumentis recondita veneratur."

[5] *Ib.* "Nam nonnulla *eorum* scripta penes nos habentur, quæ non solum quorumcumque Romanorum pontificum verum etiam *priorum* decreta in suis causis præferre noscuntur." This is an allusion to a quotation from the *False Decretals* which Hincmar had himself made (a quotation from Pope Alexander, according to the *Pseudo-Isidore*) in a letter (Ep. 11, p. 80) to Nicholas concerning Rothad.

[6] "Porro si ideo non esse decretales epistolas priscorum pontificum Rom. admittendas dicunt, quia in codice canonum non habentur ascriptæ, ergo nec Gregorii sancti . . . . scriptum," etc. *Ib.*

even if they have not been[1] codified; and there is no difference between those which have been so treated and those which from their very number could scarcely be so arranged. It is perfectly plain from this letter of 865 that, though there was a recognised code of canons, Nicholas did not pin his faith to any *codified* collection, not even to that of Dionysius, still less to that of the *Pseudo-Isidore*. The whole trend of his letter was to prove that papal decretals had to be submitted to *as such*, and consequently were as binding whether found in a code or not.[2] And so, though in this letter (ep. 75) he quotes, not indeed from the code of the *Pseudo-Isidore*, but from that of Dionysius, which Hincmar professed to receive, he also quotes, as of equal value, decretals of the Popes which had not then been inserted in *any* published code. If Nicholas did not use the *False Decretals* in this letter, it certainly cannot be shown that he used them in any other. The whole question of the *use* of the *False Decretals* by Nicholas has been thoroughly examined by Roy.[3] We will cite the conclusions to which he has arrived. Though Nicholas was acquainted with, and sometimes, as we have seen, quotes from the canonical collection of Dionysius the Little, and from one attributed to John of Antioch, he often cites decrees of his predecessors which are not found in *any collection*. Of these latter citations, a few are not authentic, and of these latter again most are *not* found among the *False Decretals*. Of the remaining very

[1] "Restat nimirum quod decretales epist. Rom. Pont. sunt recipiendæ etiam si non sunt canonum codici compaginatæ," etc. *Ib.* Though this is only a clause *in* a sentence, it expresses the conclusion to which Nicholas finally arrives.

[2] "Itaque nihil interest utrum sint omnia decretalia sedis apostolicæ constituta inter canones conciliorum immista, cum omnia in uno corpore compaginari non possint, et illa eis intersint, quæ firmitatem his quæ desunt et vigorem suum assignent." *Ib.*

[3] P. 149, Fr. ed. See also *supr.*, p. 2.

few (two or three) spurious decrees which are found both in the writings of Nicholas and in the collection of the *Pseudo-Isidore*, all are to be found in documents which, though not genuine, had been forged centuries before the days either of Nicholas or the *Pseudo-Isidore* had passed into general use, and were therefore accessible to Nicholas without the intermedium of the *False Decretals*.[1] Further, not only did Nicholas not use the great mass of the false texts assigned by the *Pseudo-Isidore* to the very earliest Popes, though they would have been very convenient for him, especially in his difficulties with Photius, but he invariably assigned to their real authors the true documents used in common by him and by the *Pseudo-Isidore*, but attributed by the latter to popes much earlier than those by whom they were actually composed. The *False Decretals* were then evidently *ignored* by Nicholas, and that, no doubt, not because he had any positive grounds for doubting their authenticity, but because he had no ready means of verifying their genuineness.

Hadrian II., however, in a letter to the bishops of the synod of Douzi-les-Près, certainly did quote[2] one of the *False Decretals*, in the shape of a letter of Pope Anterus (238–240). But the citation was only introduced by him while unfolding his approval of the action of the fathers of that synod in transferring, for grave reasons, a bishop from one See to another, and may easily have been first

[1] Thus he quotes (ep. 147, p. 1141) the spurious letter of Pope S. Clement to S. James. But this same letter had been quoted as long before as the Council of Vaison (can. 6, not 16 as in Roy) in 442. And Nicholas quotes it not to advance his *pretensions*, but to denounce adultery. And if he cites the *Acta* and *Constitutum* of Pope Silvester, he is using documents which were in existence from the end of the fifth century (*cf. L. P.*, i. p. cix. f.), and this he does either in the words of his predecessor Leo IV., or in a way other than that adopted by the *Pseudo-Isidore*.

[2] Ep. 32, ap. Labbe, T. viii. 932.

used by the council itself. In any case, the prerogatives of the Apostolic See were not advanced by Hadrian by means of the *Forged Decretals*. He never cited them again, nor, practically speaking, did any of his successors, till the middle of the eleventh century.[1] When, from the time of St. Leo IX., the said Decretals were more freely used by the popes, they were universally accepted, and the 'encroachments' on the rights of others which some pretend were made by the popes, through the instrumentality of forgeries, were by that time confessedly complete. And it has been well pointed out[2] that the tradition at Rome of practically ignoring the *False Decretals* was only broken when there came into the Chair of Peter a bishop (Bruno of Toul, S. Leo IX.), of that nation among whom the collection had first seen the light and among whom there was not the slightest doubt as to its authenticity.[3]

[1] See De Smedt's examination of the instance or two in which they were quoted by them in the interval named. P. 22 ff.

[2] By the learned Bollandist, de Smedt, *Les fausses décrétales*, p. 26.

[3] In addition to the authorities in connection with the *False Decretals* already cited in the notes, we would mention Hergenröther, *Hist. de l'Église*, iii. 202 ff.; and an article in the *Month*, March 1881.

HADRIAN II.

A.D. 867–872.

Sources.—In the *Liber Pontificalis* we have an incomplete *life* of this Pope, once ascribed to a supposed librarian 'William,' who was set down as the successor of the famous Anastasius. To 'William' was also assigned the *life* of Stephen (V.) VI. But, as usual, Hadrian's biography is generally supposed to be the work of an unknown writer, who, it is said, was under the influence of the cardinal-librarian Anastasius. Hence the omission in it of the affair of Eleutherius, the brother of Anastasius. Such, at any rate, is the view of Duchesne. For my own part, I do not think that any importance can, as a rule, be attached to what is inserted or omitted by the *L. P.* But if, as Lapôtre would seem to have proved (*cf.* his article *Le souper de Jean Diacre*, p. 369 ff., ap. *Mélanges d'archéol.*, 1901), this biography is the work of John the Deacon, the biographer of S. Gregory I., and the great friend of Anastasius, then the omission may be safely regarded as intentional. In the truncated form in which the imaginary William's *life* has come down to us, there is not much else treated of but the early years of Hadrian and his dealings with the Greek Church and with the Bulgarians. For other sources of information we must turn to his letters, of which there are 41 ap. *P. L.*, t. 122; and 3 *ib.*, t. 129. They are, as usual, to be also read in the different editions of the *Councils*.

In addition to the letters of Hincmar and Photius (on which see the sources for Nicholas I.), the letters of Hincmar of Laon (*P. L.*, t. 124), and the already mentioned *Annals* of Hincmar, etc., there are, for the history of the conversion of the Slavs, the

Life of Constantine and the *Life of Methodius*, etc. The former seems to be almost wholly taken from the *Acts* of Cyril, which had been composed by his brother Methodius. "In any case this *life* gives us the testimony of a man thoroughly *au fait* with the Byzantine and Roman world of this period. If this man is not Methodius, as I[1] believe him to be, he must at least be one of the Byzantines who accompanied the two apostles to Rome." The *life* of Methodius (known, with the *life* of St. Cyril, as the *Pannonian Legend*), though not the work of a contemporary, has been composed from the best materials, and is the best authority after the *life* of St. Cyril. The *Translatio S. Clementis Papæ*, known as the *Italian Legend*, is, at least as we now have it, the work of *Leo Ostiensis* († before 1118). But here again there is evidence of an earlier, if not contemporary, edition of this *life*. The *Italian Legend* is to be found ap. Bolland., *Acta SS.*, ix. Mart., T. ii. Father Martinov (*Annus Eccles. Græco-Slavicus*, prefixed to *Acta SS.*, October, T. xi. p. 168) will not allow that the *Pannonian Legends* are to be preferred as authorities to the Italian, and is astonished at the praise bestowed upon them by some authors, especially at that given to the *life* of Methodius. Martinov, at the place cited, gives the substance of the *Pannonian Legends*. His views as to the superior value of the *Italian Legend*, which he describes as for the most part the work of an eye-witness of the translation of St. Clement's relics, viz., of Gaudericus, bishop of Velletri, are shared by Cardinal Bartolini.[2] Finally the *Moravian Legend* (ap. *Acta SS.*, *l. c.*) narrates the conversion of the different Slav peoples effected by the saints, and seems to have been written some considerable time after their death.

Works.—To those mentioned under Nicholas I. add, for the conversion of the Slavs, the excellent work, *Cyrille et Méthode*, by Leger, Paris, 1868; *SS. Cirillo e Metodio*, by Bartolini, Roma, 1881; and *Jean VIII.*, by Lapôtre, on which see under John VIII. Another very valuable work on the same subject is, *St. Cyrille et St. Méthode*, by A. d'Avril, Paris, 1885. And, for the

[1] Lapôtre, *Jean VIII.*, 104 f. Cyril's original name was Constantine.

[2] *Cirillo e Met.*, pp. vi., vii. Lapôtre notes that this *life*, in the original form in which it was begun by John, the Deacon, and finished by Guadericus, has come down to us in an incomplete form. *Cf.* *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, iv. 267 ff., and *Florilegium*, p. 373 ff.

affair of the two Hincmars, the *life* of Hincmar of Laon, by Cellot, which is printed in Labbe, *Conc.*, viii. p. 1664 f.

Emperor of the East.	Emperor of the West.
Basil I. (the Macedonian), 867–886.	Louis II., 850–875.

Hadrian before he was Pope.

THOUGH the reign of Hadrian did not last for more than five years, an extraordinary amount of work seems to have been accomplished by that septuagenarian pontiff. Whether it is that chance has preserved for us more records, or at least more detailed records of his doings, or whether it is that work, which had been attracted to Rome by the splendid energy of his predecessor, was waiting there for its completion, what was actually done by a man who had already passed [1] the allotted span of human life when he became Pope cannot fail to strike with astonishment all who consider it.

Hadrian, who was a member of a family which had already given two popes (Stephen (IV.) V. and Sergius II.) to the Church, was the son of Talarus, afterwards a bishop, and was a citizen of the third region of the city. His virtues attracted the attention of Gregory IV., who made him a subdeacon; and, in accordance with the usual custom in such cases, brought him into the Lateran palace, to be trained in piety and learning. Ordained cardinal-priest of St. Mark's (842), he so distinguished himself by his blameless and manly administration of it, that "he was revered

[1] He was seventy-five when he became Pope. "(Cum) iste imprœsentiarum tertio quintum et vigesimum annum transiret." *L. P.*, *in vit.* In Duchesne's ed. of the *L. P.*, n. iv., however, the text stands thus: "(Cum) iste in presbiterio quintum," etc., which would only prove that he had been cardinal-priest of St. Mark's for twenty-five years when he became Pope. Taking all the circumstances of the case into consideration, this is more likely to be the true reading.

by the people not only as one who had been made a priest, but as the future Pope."[1] Papabile

His charity.

Of his various virtues, the one most marked out by his biographer for our admiration was his love of the poor, and what others, with less faith than himself, would call his extravagant charity towards them. But his continual prayer in the Church of Our Lady "ad præsepe," had begotten within him such confidence in Our Lord and His blessed Mother, that he felt assured that his charities would never leave him without resource, and that in carrying out his works of mercy, he might safely encounter any pecuniary risks. In illustration of his charity and trust in God, his biographer, from whom we have drawn all these details, relates the following:—On one occasion, after he had received with his fellow priests, according to custom, forty denarii[2] from Pope Sergius, he was unable, on his return home, to get near his house on account of the number of pilgrims who flocked there "as to a public granary." At the sight, the good priest was filled with a holy joy, and turning to his almoner (*equester*), he cried: "What is it to have money in comparison with having so many brothers?" Thereupon, though he saw he had not

[1] *Ib.* The whole of this paragraph is from the same source. His signature is to be found among those affixed to the acts of the council of 853, "Adrianus presbyter tituli S. Marci." At the same council there was a Talarus, bishop of Minturno.

[2] Which Platina (*in vit. Had.*) gives as 'julios.' As far back as the pontificate of St. Gregory I. can be traced this custom, on the part of the popes, of giving largesses (*presbiteria*) to the clergy. St. Gregory used to give them on Easter Sunday morning (Joan. Diac., *in vit.*, ii. 25). The custom grew more pronounced as the Middle Ages advanced. *Cf.* the *Ordo Romanus* of Cencius Camerarius (end of twelfth century), ap. Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. p. 188 f.; and that of Benedict, Canon of St. Peter's, in the first half of the twelfth century—ap. Migne, *P.L.*, t. 179. Both ordos are also to be read ap. *P. L.*, t. 78. On the latter, *cf. L'itiner. di Einsied. e l'ordine di Ben. canon.*, Lanciani, Roma, 1891.

enough 'pence' to give one apiece even to a third of the pilgrims; "in the power of Christ," said he, "who, with five loaves and two fishes fed five thousand men, I will give not one but three pence to each one here." This he did, and still the almoner declared that the supply of money was not exhausted. When after each of the cardinal's household had also received his three pence, and there were still six left over, "How bountiful is the Almighty," exclaimed Hadrian to his astonished almoner, "for He has not only given three pence each to so many of our brethren, but has kept three for each of us also." There is no exaggeration in the pretty thought of his biographer, that "mercy came out from his mother's womb together with him, and grew along with him."[1]

It is exceedingly difficult to place in their true light the events which centred round the election and consecration of the successor of Nicholas. For this, doubts regarding questions of chronology and uncertainty in connection with the identity of certain important individuals are responsible. It is indeed certain that Bishop Arsenius, who had fallen out of favour with Nicholas, again acquired influence with Hadrian, while remaining well-disposed towards the emperor[2]; but it is by no means clear whether he was acting for the emperor in supporting Hadrian, or

[1] That Hadrian was 'most liberal' is also the testimony of John, the Deacon, in his *life* of St. Gregory I. (iv. c. 23). The librarian Anastasius, who was devoted to the memory of Nicholas, writing to Ado of Vienne (ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 742), says: "Habemus autem præsulem Adrianum nomine, virum per omnia, quantum ad bonos mores pertinet, valde strenuum et industrium."

[2] "Pendet autem anima ejus (Hadrian) ex anima avunculi mei, vestri vero Arsenii; quamvis idem eo quod inimicitias multas obeuntis præsulis pertulerit, ac per hoc imperatori faveat, a studio ecclesiasticæ correctionis paululum refriguisset." The important letter of Anastasius to Ado, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129. The emperor had made Arsenius "apocrisiarius Sedis Romanæ," as the *Libel. de imp. potest.* (ap. *ib.*, p. 965) expresses it; *i.e.* no doubt, had made him his *missus*.

how far he was the head and front of the opposition, which immediately displayed itself, to the policy of Pope Nicholas. Nor, again, as it seems to me, can the identity of Anastasius the librarian and Anastasius the antipope be regarded as proved, and it is not certain that Arsenius was the father of the librarian. Further, in the strife of parties which followed the death of Nicholas, it is hard to say whether Lambert of Spoleto was acting for himself or the emperor when he made his violent entry into Rome,[1] and equally hard to say when exactly he did make it. It was made *tempore consecrationis*.[2] Does that mean before, during, or after Hadrian's consecration? In view of these uncertainties, our narrative will closely follow the order of events, presumably arranged chronologically, set forth in the *Liber Pontificalis*.

Hadrian's election.

In Hadrian, at any rate, the 'nolo episcopare' was not a mere form. Twice before, on the demise of Pope Leo IV., and then again on that of Benedict III., had the whole united body of clergy, nobility, and people pressed him to take on his shoulders the burden of the supreme pontificate. Twice with argument and 'exquisite excuses' had he with modesty declined the proferred honour. On the death of Nicholas, however, the will of the united clergy, nobility, and people was not to be baulked. Hadrian they, one and all, rich and poor, would have. The two sections of the nobility,[3] viz., the clerical and the lay aristocracy presumably, seemed at first to be divided. But it was only, says the papal biographer, because each party doubted whether Hadrian was duly loved by the other, and feared that the other would vote for some one else. When these

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 161. [2] *L. P.*

[3] "Proceres vero, licet solito in duas partes corpore viderentur esse divisi," etc. *L. P.*, n. 4. The biographer goes on to relate that many good people, both clerical and lay, had learnt from visions that Hadrian was to be Pope.

doubts and fears had been cleared up, bishops and priests, nobles and people, with one accord hurried Hadrian from the Liberian basilica (S. Maria ad Præsepe) to the Lateran palace, where they installed him Pope. On hearing of the election, the imperial *missi*, who happened at that time to be in the city, expressed great indignation that the 'Quirites' had not invited them to share in the election. However, when they were told that they had not been invited to take part in the election, not from any want of respect for the emperor, but for fear lest a precedent should be created which would require the presence of imperial envoys at the election of the popes,[1] they were mollified.

The emperor approves of the election.

As soon as they went 'to salute' the newly-elected Pontiff, they were literally besieged by the people crying out for the consecration of Hadrian. The Roman people were in one of their *furores*. The senators had the greatest difficulty in preventing them from having Hadrian consecrated forthwith, without waiting for any imperial assent. Louis, however, hastened to assure the Romans of his satisfaction at the good choice they had made, and that their unanimity made him also desirous of Hadrian's consecration.

Hadrian is consecrated.

He was accordingly consecrated on Sunday, December 14, 867, at St. Peter's, by Donatus, bishop of Ostia, Peter, bishop of Cava (in the archdiocese of Salerno), and Leo, bishop of Silva-Candida[2] (a town in Tuscany on the Aurelian Way). The two latter bishops took the place of

[1] This paragraph is straight from the *L. P.* *Cf.* Hincmar, *Annal.*, ad an. 867. By the constitution of Lothaire, it only belonged to the emperor to ratify the 'decree' of the election, when sent to him, if it was in order. These efforts made by the emperors to extend their influence over papal elections naturally caused the Popes to be anxious to do away with it altogether.

[2] Still the *L. P.*

the bishop of Albano, who was dead, and of Formosus of Porto, who was in Bulgaria.

At the Mass which the Pope celebrated on this occasion, all, we are told, were anxious to receive Holy Communion at his hands. And, as an earnest of the conciliatory policy he intended to pursue, he forthwith, on the condition of their performing satisfactory penance, restored to ecclesiastical communion Theutgard of Triers, Zachary of Anagni, and Anastasius, the former antipope.[1] On his return to the Lateran palace, he further signalised his consecration day by abolishing the custom which had gradually come into vogue of selling the presents given to the Pope on such occasions. After retaining what would serve his table,[2] Hadrian caused the rest to be distributed among the poor, saying that what had been freely received should be freely given; and that senseless and inanimate coin ought not to be more loved than reasonable creatures.

Unrest in Rome and elsewhere.

The consecration of Hadrian did not take place a day too soon, for every fraction of authority was needed to stem the anarchy which was rapidly getting the Western continent of Europe into its grip. No sooner had the firm restraining hand of Nicholas been relaxed in death than the clerical and lay elements of disorder had begun to assert themselves at once. Writing to his friend Ado, archbishop of Vienne, the librarian Anastasius calls on him to resist the ravening wolves who broke into the fold immediately

[1] "Simulque Anastasius, qui dudum a Leone Benedictoque presbiterio denudatus, inter laicos communicare solitus erat." *L. P.*, n. x. If Anastasius, the librarian, was the same person as Anastasius, the antipope, it is hard to believe, considering his devotion to Nicholas, that that Pontiff would not have granted him this favour.

[2] Pagi, *in vit. Had.*, § 3, says Hadrian reserved what was enough for the sacrifice of the Mass. But, in the editions of the *Liber. Pont.* which we have examined, the word is 'mensarum' and not 'missarum' (retentis solum quæ usibus mensarum sufficerent reliquiis).

after the death of Nicholas. "All those whom he reproved for adultery or other crimes are burning to have his acts reversed and his writings destroyed,"[1] he says. By no means for the last time in the history of the popes, the most extravagant rumours were diligently circulated, the wildest talk indulged in immediately after the death of the late Pope. It was confidently asserted[2] that the emperor was in favour of the malcontents, that there was to be a council held in Rome in which the metropolitans of Gaul were to get back their 'status,' and that Nicholas had been guilty of heresy.[3] Party feeling ran higher, or rather, the bitterness of faction[4] fights waxed more furious than ever. "Many sons of the holy Church of God" were exiled or imprisoned on one pretext or another. On the strength of false charges, the emperor had, during the vacancy of the Holy See, banished the bishops of Nepi and Velletri, and John Hymmonides, the author of the life of S. Gregory the Great. Moved by the Pope's letters, however, Louis not only sent back with honour the two bishops to the city, but ordered the release of those whom *private revenge* had been powerful enough to incarcerate on the plea of high treason against the emperor.[5] Evidently the imperial party, or rather, that faction which strove to

[1] "Nunc congregatio omnis, quos ille vel pro diverso adulterii genere, vel pro aliis criminibus redarguit, ad hoc exarserunt ut universa ejus opera destruere et cuncta scripta delere meditari non metuant." Ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 742.

[2] *Ib.*

[3] *Ib.* Anastasius does not look for much good from the Romans, for he says that there were but few of them who had not bent the knee to Baal; but that there were many in Gaul.

[4] "Qui (filii Ecclesiæ) factiosorum tyrannide liberius solito sæviente inter unius decessionem et alterius substitutionem Pontificis, diversis agebantur exiliis, variisque afficiebantur incommodis." *L. P.*

[5] "Quoscumque privata simultate tanquam reos Imperatoriæ majestatis in ergastulis quilibet truserat, ut reverterentur præcepit (Augustus) absolvi." *Ib.*

cover its own self-seeking under a show of zeal for the imperial authority, had not been idle during the interregnum. And we may well doubt whether the election of Hadrian had the sweetly simple character assigned to it by his biographer, or, perchance, suspect that the language in which he has described it is that of irony.

rges
ight
inst
lrian.

Those who were hoping to profit by the weakness of the supreme authority, whether in Church or in State, did not cease to spread abroad reports especially calculated to discredit[1] the deeds of Pope Nicholas. When they saw Hadrian continuing the public works of his predecessor, and showing in every way, even by the manner in which in his private life he copied the conduct of Nicholas, that he was desirous of walking in his footsteps, they gave out that he was a mere Nicholaïte. On the other hand, when it was observed that Hadrian kept near him certain of these malcontents of whose repentance as a matter of fact he entertained hopes, it was bruited about that he himself had in mind to rescind the acts of his predecessor. Nothing so much proves the esteem in which Nicholas was held by the Catholic world as the sensation which this report caused. Letters poured in to Rome from the bishops of the West,[2] respectfully yet repeatedly impressing on Hadrian that he must be true to the memory of Nicholas. Some Greeks and Orientals who were in Rome at this time (among them men from Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constanti-

[1] "Quia omnibus ejus acta penitus infringere nitebantur." *Ib.*

[2] "Unde accidit, ut omnes Occidentalium regionum episcopi, solemnes ac honorificas litteras emittentes religiosam ejus (Nicolai) memoriam . . . . excolendam summo Pontifici jugiter inculcarent." Among those who wrote in this vein was Ado of Vienne, as is shown by a fragment of a letter of Hadrian to him, which he has preserved. "Quæ pro privilegiis ecclesiæ Romanæ vel decretis decessoris mei apostolicæ memoriæ P. Nicolai sine mutilatione servandis hortaris laudamus, quæ suades admittimus . . . . Siquidem acta præfati pontificis . . . . a nullo patimur quolibet pacto convelli." Ado, *Chron.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii.

nople, some of whom were on an embassy [1] from "the rulers of the world," and others partisans of Ignatius and opponents of Photius), more easily impressible than the Westerns, went even to the length of privately withdrawing themselves from intercourse with the Pope. To get a favourable opportunity to give the lie to all these idle tales, Hadrian invited people in larger numbers than usual to the banquet that was wont to be held before Lent.[2] At the dinner he not only waited upon his guests, but, to put them more at their ease, sat with them, a thing which, we are assured, he knew that no other Pope had ever done before him. When the repast was over, he prostrated himself before all his guests, and begged their prayers for the "Holy Catholic Church," for the emperor Louis, that he might subdue the Saracens, and for himself, who had to govern, weak as he was, the great flock that Christ had committed to St. Peter. On their crying out that the Pope ought rather to pray for them, he went on to beg them to continue praying for his predecessor, the most holy and orthodox Pope Nicholas; for to pray for the very good was to give thanks to God.

Great was the joy of the Easterns when they heard from Hadrian's own lips that he was only anxious to accomplish the work begun by his predecessor. After they had thrice given long life to "Our lord Hadrian, by God's decree supreme Pontiff and universal Pope," at his request, "everlasting memory" was thrice acclaimed to the most holy and orthodox Pope Nicholas, the new Elias, the new Phinees.[3]

[1] The envoys of Basil, of whom mention will be made later. So many Greek monks were in Rome at this time that to the disgust of John the Deacon, Gregory I.'s biographer, that Pope's monastery on the Cœlian was given over to them. *Vit. Greg.*, iv. c. 82.

[2] "Sexta feria lxx." (*i.e.* Septuagesimæ), Friday, February 20, 868. *Ib.*

[3] All this direct from the *L. P.*, nn. xvi.–xix. Chroniclers and councils also give Nicholas the title of the new Elias.

Hadrian's conciliatory policy regarding Lothaire keeps up the unrest.

One of the chief factors in keeping alive the unsettled state of men's minds towards Hadrian was the suspicion with which many regarded his attitude towards Lothaire and his divorce. Just as the Orientals were afraid that he might regard the party of Photius in a different light to that in which it had been viewed by Nicholas, a strong section in Rome was evidently afraid that his conciliatory disposition might lead him to undo the work of his predecessor in the matter of the divorce. It was to no purpose that he was at pains to declare[1] that his mind and will were in harmony with those of Nicholas, and that consequently his acts must also be, and that he would never tolerate any attempt to render nugatory the action of his great predecessor.

Men saw that Hadrian had given leave (868) to Lothaire to come to Rome to plead his cause again, a request which Nicholas had distinctly refused.[2] They heard that the excommunication pronounced against Waldrada had been removed (February 868). It was pointed out that both Lothaire and the refractory Gunther had been given Holy Communion by the Pope himself at Monte Cassino (June 869). And at length (July 9, 869) Lothaire actually arrived in Rome. The upholders of the policy of Nicholas thought that Hadrian had a strange way of continuing that policy. They remembered that he had spoken[3] of the necessity of his conforming to the altered state of the times, and

[1] Ep. 3, ap. *P. L.*, or Labbe, viii. 899, to the synod of Troyes. "Non quippe est diversitas operis, ubi est una eademque concordia voluntatis." To Ado of Vienne he wrote (*ib.*, Ep. 12, or Labbe, viii. 939): "Utrique non diversum sed unum studium gerimus." And, on the other hand: "Siquidem acta præfati pontificis . . . . a nullo patimur quolibet pacto convelli." *Ib. Cf.* Ep. 3.

[2] For the case of Lothaire, see under *Nicholas I.*

[3] "Si forte sunt quæ . . . . *magistra* æquitate gessit (Nicholas) . . . . et nos . . . . aliter moderando mitigamus, non illa cassare, sed quæ ipse cœpit consummare dignoscimur." Ep. ad Adonem.

moderating what the condition of things in his day had forced Nicholas to do *with masterful justice*. There was a general fear that he was going to carry his conciliatory policy too far, and that the greatest injury would be done to the whole Church.[1] He must be strongly dissuaded from proceeding further in favouring the designs of Lothaire: so that when he summoned a council to treat of Lothaire's case, after the latter had arrived in Rome, he found that his policy was not approved by his advisers. The opposition was led by Formosus,[2] who had returned from Bulgaria, apparently in January 868, and had met with an enthusiastic reception. The speech he delivered on this occasion has been preserved, and has been already alluded to. He contrived to prevent any decision from being come to at that time, and to bring it about that the affairs in question, especially the affair of the divorce, should be referred to a larger assembly to be held in a year's time. The death of Lothaire, which occurred within a few weeks after the holding of this synod, put an end to any necessity for calling such a council together, and in no little degree to the unsettled state of things in Rome.

Outrageous conduct of the Duke of Spoleto.

Meanwhile events were happening there which testify, far more clearly than words, to the growing feudalism or anarchy of the times. Of the black deeds to be done in Rome during the tenth century, there are now lurid shadows coming before. In the midst[3] of the rejoicings connected with Hadrian's consecration, Lambert, duke of Spoleto,[4]

[1] Ado, in his chronicle (ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii.), tells us that the bishops of Gaul "Periculum generale in ecclesia Dei oriri timebant ne Pontifex Romanus *favoribus inclinatus* . . . . Romanæ ecclesiæ vulnus erroris infligeret."

[2] Lapôtre, with his profound critical skill, has most acutely proved this point. (*Cf. Hadrien II.*, ap. *Revue des Quest. Histor.*, 1880, p. 377 f.)

[3] "Tempore consecrationis." *L. P.* Hence, as it would seem, not "*before* his consecration," as Gregorovius thinks.

[4] Relying on the authority of a non-contemporary, partisan, political

burst into the city with an armed force, and conducted himself as though he were a conqueror with the rights of war. Neither ecclesiastical nor civil property was spared, virginity itself was not respected by the lawless satellites of the duke—satellites in whom, from the names of his chief adherents, Gregorovius sees the "ancestors of the later Astalli, Gualterii, Ilperini, Oddoni, and Tiberti." At the first opportunity the conduct of Lambert was denounced by the Romans to the emperor. But what power Louis possessed at this time he was employing against the Saracens of Southern Italy. And though the outrage caused great indignation to be manifested against Lambert, not only on the part of foreigners[1] but on that of the emperor, his conduct was for some time unpunished. It was not till some years later (871), when he thought fit to turn his arms against Louis himself, that he was, for a time at least, driven from his duchy by the emperor. Meanwhile, till they should restore their ill-gotten goods,

pamphleteer (once thought to be a Lombard priest called Eutropius, and to have written, about 900, the *Tractat. de jur. Imp. in Imp. Rom.*), Gregorovius (iii. 157) believes that the dukes of Spoleto had the right to be present in the place of the emperors at the election of a new Pope. But we have seen in the text that even the emperor himself had no right to be present. It should be noted that the 'tract' here described by Gregorovius, as written by a Lombard priest named Eutropius, about A.D. 900, is the *same* production as the one quoted by him as the work of an imperialist partisan written about the year 950, and cited as the *Libellus de imp. potest. in urbe Roma* (iii. 8 n.). The pamphlet is printed as belonging to Eutropius in Migne (*P. L.*, t. 129), and under no name in Watterich, *Vit. Pontif.*, i. But *cf. supra* under the *sources* for the *life* of Nicholas I. Muratori (*Annal.*, ad an. 868) properly describes it as "di poco peso."

[1] "Iram principum (Louis and his wife), et invidiam pene cunctorum Gallorum . . . . incurrit." (*L. P.*) *Cf.* Erchempert, *Hist. Lang.*, n. 35; *Hist. Ignot. Cass.*, n. 22 (ap. *R. I. S.*, ii. pt. i.), etc. *Cf.* also Muratori, *Ann.*, 868–871. If the reader should consult the original authorities, he will find that it is impossible to unravel the career of Lambert, duke or count of Spoleto. The *Hist. Ignoti* is reprinted in the *M. G. SS. Langob.* under the title of *Chronica S. Benedicti Casin.*

and make full satisfaction to him, Hadrian excommunicated the other plunderers. Some of them made the necessary atonement and were pardoned, but the others definitely threw in their lot with Lambert.

Domestic affliction of Hadrian, 868.

Another of those events alluded to above, which foreshadow the lawlessness of the tenth century, was enacted in the bosom of the Pope's own family, and throws around his private life a more tragic interest than attaches to that of almost any other Pontiff. It is related by Hincmar in his annals (ad an. 868). "Like father, like son," was illustrated in the case of Talarus and his son Hadrian. Both of them were married before they entered the ranks of the clergy, and both became bishops. When Hadrian became Pope, his wife Stephania was still alive, and living with her daughter. In the letter, which we have already quoted, from Anastasius to Ado of Vienne, the former assures his friend that the new Pope placed great reliance on the writer's father (uncle?), and Ado's friend—the rich bishop Arsenius; and that, too, though for some time past he had not been in good odour, owing to his having been under the displeasure of Nicholas and to having consequently drifted into the imperial party. Anastasius concludes his letter by begging Ado to use his best endeavours that the influence possessed by Arsenius with the emperor and the Pope may benefit the Church. Now it was precisely from the family of Arsenius that trouble came to the Pope. Eleutherius, the son of Arsenius, relying possibly on his father's influence at the imperial court, carried off and married by force Hadrian's daughter, though she was already betrothed to another (March 10, 868). To obtain immunity for his son, Arsenius set off to Beneventum to buy with his treasures the protection of the Empress Ingelberga, who was as avaricious as the bishop himself. He was, however, overtaken by sudden death, and his son,

finding that he could not escape the imperial *missi*, in a fit of despairing fury slew both Stephania and her daughter before he was himself put to death. As the story ran that Anastasius, whom Hadrian had made "librarian of the Roman Church" in the very beginning of his pontificate, and who was the brother[1] (or cousin?) of Eleutherius, had been the chief instigator of his violence, the outraged Pontiff summoned a synod to try him. In the sentence which he promulgated against Anastasius (October 4), Hadrian recapitulated the sentences passed upon him by Leo IV. and Benedict III., and his pardon by Nicholas I. On the strength of certain charges, and no doubt *prima facie* evidence, Anastasius was again declared excommunicated until *he should in synod clear himself of the accusations brought against him*.[2] The points of the indictment against the cardinal-priest were that he had stolen from the Lateran palace the acts of the synod which had condemned him; that he had endeavoured to sow discord between the Church and the emperor; that he had been the cause of a certain Adalgrim, who had fled for 'sanctuary' to a church, losing his eyes and tongue; and that, as one of his relations, the priest Ado, had declared before them all, he had urged Eleutherius to the murders of which he had been guilty.

Of these serious charges it would seem that Anastasius must have cleared himself. For the very next year (869) we see him sent, with Hadrian's approval, to Constantinople, as the ambassador of the emperor Louis, and there executing

[1] Hincmar distinctly calls Anastasius the brother of Eleutherius; and *an* Anastasius calls himself the *nephew* of Arsenius. Hence if the librarian is to be identified with the quondam turbulent cardinal, we must either suppose Hincmar to have here made a mistake in calling Anastasius the brother, rather than the cousin, of Eleutherius, or, what is thought to be more probable, that the letter to Ado is corrupt.

[2] "Sancimus . . . . ut omni communione ecclesiastica privatus existat, donec de omnibus quibus impetitur nobis coram synodo rationem ponat." Hincmar, *Annal.*, an. 868.

business[1] for the Pope, and also exercising the office of librarian under both Hadrian and John VIII.

These two incidents let us see what we have to expect on any further weakening of the imperial power, or on the advent to the papal throne of men whose characters were not of the firmest. The weak point, and it is an amiable one, of the papal government has always been that it has been conducted on lines that are too paternal.

Actard of Nantes.

Among the affairs entered into, but not brought to a conclusion by the great Nicholas, was the matter of the dukes or kings of Brittany, and the bishops in the country over which they claimed sway.[2] Among those who, from different parts of the world, set out from home with letters for Nicholas, and reached Rome to find that Hadrian had succeeded him in the See of Peter, was Actard, bishop of Nantes.

When Nomenoius, duke of Brittany, was aiming at making himself king, and independent of Charles the Bald in every way, Actard of Nantes refused to be present on the occasion when he succeeded in getting himself anointed king (*c.* 848). The new monarch promptly drove Actard from his See, and placed another in his stead. Such, at any rate, is the account of the deposition of Actard in the *Chronicle of Nantes* (c. 12). But as its recent able editor, Merlet, points out, Nomenoius was not master of Nantes when he was crowned king (848 or 849), so that Actard was probably only driven out of his See when Nantes fell (850) into the hands of the new king. Restored

[1] Anast., *in præfat. Conc. VIII.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 17. Lapôtre, in his work *De Anastasio bibliothec. Sedis Ap.*, has written at length on these matters. I have not, however, succeeded in obtaining a copy of this treatise; but, in trying to procure it, was informed that it had been withdrawn from circulation, as its learned author had seen reasons to abandon some of the propositions he had there maintained.

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 94 f.

by a victory of Charles, Actard was again driven out by King Solomon.[1] His position naturally excited sympathy, and when he went to Rome in 867, as the bearer of the synodal letter of the Council of Troyes (October 867), he also took with him a letter from Charles the Bald to Nicholas, in which he was warmly commended by that monarch. The Pope was told that contact with the Normans and Bretons had brought exile and chains upon Actard, and that his once flourishing episcopal city had been destroyed, and had for ten years been a desert. Charles proposed, with the Pope's consent,[2] to give him a vacant bishopric, as there was no hope of his being able to return to his own See.

This letter, along with the other documents entrusted to him, Actard delivered to Pope Hadrian,[3] who showed the strongest interest in the unfortunate bishop. Of his concern for him he gave prompt proof by granting him various favours himself, and by endeavouring to procure others for him.[4] He told Charles the Bald[5] (February 868) that he granted the favours, because he thought it "unbecoming that any one in trouble should come to the Apostolic See, where help is ever to be found by Catholics, and go away without receiving consolation." Much pleased with the modesty which he found in the bishop, he gave his consent, not only to any vacant episcopal see being bestowed upon him, but even any metropolitan see. He

[1] Hinc., Ep. 31, n. 11, ap *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 218. Solomon had assassinated Erispoius, November 857.

[2] "Cui (Actardo) quia nulla manet spes in propria, si annuit et favet vigilantissima vestræ discretionis solertia . . . . optamus vacantis sedis constituatur in cathedra." (Ep. Car., ap. Labbe, vii. p. 880.)

[3] Hinc., *Annal.*, 867–8.

[4] *Cf.* Epp. Had., 7–12, ap. Labbe, 901–8.

[5] Ep. 8. "Indignum ducimus, quemquam ad apostolicam sedem, ubi semper catholicis subvenitur, tribulatum accedere, et non consolatum recedere."

also bestowed upon him the honour of the pallium for himself only, as he took care to point out both to Actard himself and to the bishops of the Synod of Soissons (866) who had interested themselves in his behalf, and not for the new see to which he might be attached.[1] Finally, he wrote to Herard of Tours (March 8, 868), to ask him to grant to Actard a monastery which he formerly held in the archdiocese: "so that he[2] who has nothing of his own, may hence at least be able to procure the necessaries of life by the help of what others have." Hadrian did not exert himself in Actard's behalf to no purpose; for, on the death of Herard, archbishop of Tours, he was translated to that see (871). With such deserved ill-favour, however, was translation in general then regarded in the Church, that there were not wanting men narrow-minded enough not to be able to see that there are times at least when certain laws are "more honoured in the breach than the observance." Among these men was even Hincmar of Rheims.[3]

Hincmar of Rheims and Hincmar of Laon.

This same Hincmar was to be a cause of trouble to Hadrian, as he had been to his predecessors. In the letter of Anastasius to his friend Ado of Vienne, already several times quoted, the librarian expressed a doubt whether the new Pope would himself take in hand all the work

[1] Ep. 7. "Ut scilicet habeat pro exilio et catena pallii ornamenta, non ad ecclesiæ, cui incardinandus est, perpetuum institutum, sed ad suum specialem certique temporis usum."

[2] Ep. 10. *Cf.* on Actard, Jager, *Hist. de l'église de France*, v. pp. 59 f., 227 f., 252. In his letter (ep. 32, *ib.*, p. 932) to the bishops of the Synod of Douzi (871), the Pope says that, in accordance with their request, "per nostræ ap. auctoritatis decretum constituimus (Actardum) cardinalem metropolitanum et archiepiscopum Turonicæ ecclesiæ atque provinciæ." The quotation is interesting as furnishing an instance of the fact that the word 'cardinal' only originally stood for the first ecclesiastic in a parish or diocese.

[3] *Cf.* the letter cited above.

of Nicholas, or leave some of it to others.[1] But his actions must soon have made it plain to Anastasius and to the world at large that, despite his age, he had a great capacity for business. His share in the affair of Wulfad and his companions has been already set down under 'Leo IV.,' and in that of the divorce question of King Lothaire, under the *life* of Nicholas. We will now look into the bitter dispute between the two Hincmars, and see what part Hadrian took in it.

Through the influence of Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, there was elected to succeed Pardulus, bishop of Laon (†c. 856), one of Hincmar's suffragans, a nephew of the metropolitan's who also bore the name of Hincmar, and who had been brought up by the archbishop.[2] Between the uncle and the nephew there was that similarity of character which is more generally found between father and son. Both were self-willed, and, while themselves restive under the hand of authority, were, as generally happens in such cases, inclined to bear heavily upon others who were their inferiors. Hincmar of Laon, however, had neither the learning nor authority of his uncle on the one hand, nor his nobility of character and prudence on the other. The bishop began to get himself into difficulties by a quarrel with his sovereign, Charles the Bald (868)—a quarrel, however, which the tact of his uncle managed to prevent[3] from becoming serious for his nephew. Hincmar of Laon must have been one of those people to whom experience teaches nothing. The very same year he was again at cross-purposes with the king, and,

[1] "De quo adhuc utrum ecclesiastica negotia omnia, an partem curare velit, ignoramus." Ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 742. In view of the context, probably the better translation of this passage makes Anastasius doubt whether Hadrian will be impartial, or attach himself to a faction.

[2] Ep. Hinc., ap. *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 498.

[3] At the Council of Pistres (August 30, 868).

this time, too, with his uncle. He had violently expelled Count Norman from an ecclesiastical fief belonging to his see, which he had promised the king to give him. Of this transaction he sent a garbled account to the Pope, representing both the king[1] and Norman as violaters of ecclesiastical property, and informing him that he had made a vow to go to Rome. On the receipt of this communication from the bishop of Laon, Hadrian addressed (perhaps in November 868) two letters,[2] much to the same effect, to Hincmar and to Charles. To both of them he says that, as his correspondent has engaged to come to Rome, the Pope has on his side forbidden him to defer the fulfilment of his promise beyond the 1st of August (869); Norman is to be excommunicated by apostolic authority unless he restores the possessions of the Church of Laon, and Hincmar is to be punished by his uncle if he puts off carrying out his intention of coming to Rome. While he is absent on his visit 'ad limina,' Hadrian commends the charge of the temporalities of his See to the king and to the archbishop. Whoever tampers with them is to be excommunicated. In the letter to Charles there is one more sentence than in that to the archbishop. It is a sentence which seems to show that 'Laon' had thrown blame upon the king. Hadrian says that when he hears that, like his predecessors, Charles is good to the Church, he rejoices; but that he is saddened when he hears of the king, contrary to his wont, oppressing anyone.[3]

Charles was naturally not a little angry when this letter was put into his hands at Quercy[4] (December 1, 868). Hincmar o Laon appeals to the Pope, 869.

[1] At least such was Charles's contention in his indictment (*petitio proclamationis*) of 'Laon,' which he presented before the Council of Douzi (871). The passage from Hadrian's letter (of 868) to him, which Charles quoted, seems to prove his assertion (Labbe, viii. 1549).

[2] Ap. Labbe, viii. 914–5. [3] Ep. 17, ap. Labbe, *ib.*, 915.

[4] Hinc., *Annal.*, 868. "Commotus (Carolus) contra Hincmarum

'Laon' was summoned to appear before a synod at Verberie-sur-Oise. That he might not go resourceless before this assembly, the bishop held a diocesan synod (April 19, 869), where it was arranged that, if the tide turned against him, and he were not to be allowed to go to Rome, his clergy were to faithfully observe the interdict which he would then lay on the diocese. At the Synod of Verberie (April 24), 'Laon' appealed to the Pope. And as, by the order of the king, he had to go to prison, he laid his diocese under an interdict.

As for his appeal to the Pope, the archbishop declared more than once that the conduct of 'Laon' showed that the appeal was a mere sham, and that he had no real intention of going to Rome. When he got into trouble, then out came the appeal; but as soon as the trouble had blown over, he said no more about Rome.[1]

At the request "of the Church of Laon," which naturally soon grew restive under the preposterous interdict which its bishop had laid upon it, Hincmar of Rheims, in his capacity of metropolitan, removed it. According to the latter, it was stated, in the appeal presented to him by the Church of Laon, that his nephew had ordered his priests to refrain not only from offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, or burying the dead, but even from

Laudunensem episcopum, quia Romam sine illius conscientia miserat, et epistolas pro quibus non convenerat obtinuerat, eidem episcopo valde infensus erat."

[1] *Cf.* Ep. Hinc. Rh. ad Hinc. L. ("Nunc, inquit"—ap *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 506). *Cf.* another letter of the same, dated May 24, 869 (*ib.*, 526 f. *sub fin.*). "Quod mandasti quoniam in synodo nuper in Vermeria (Verberie) habita, sedem apostolicam appellasti, manifestissime omnes illi episcopi . . . . qui fuere in synodo, regulariter te sedem apostolicam non appellasse cognoscunt. . . . . Ceterum nec tibi, nec cuiquam alii Romam ire, quantum ex me est, contradico." *Cf.* the 'petitio' of Charles the Bald to the bishops of the Synod of Douzi (Labbe, viii. 1551).

giving the last sacraments to the dying, or baptising the children.[1]

This proper exercise of authority on the part of Hincmar of Rheims was the cause of fresh disturbances between uncle and nephew, when the latter was released from prison, as he was after a short time.[2] A violent war of words at once began. Long letters full of quotations from the Fathers, decretals of the Popes, false and otherwise, passed between them.

To bring matters concerning 'Laon' to a head, Charles assembled a synod at Attigny, on the river Aisne (May 870). Finding that the feeling of the council was against him, 'Laon' declared in writing that he would for the future be obedient to his king and to his archbishop. But before all the accusations against him had been disposed of, he fled from the synod. He felt he had no case. But again to gain time, he made known to his uncle that he renewed his appeal to the Pope, "who has the right of judging the whole Church,"[3] and begged him to obtain from the king leave for him to go to Rome. But again events proved that the younger Hincmar was not in earnest in his appeal. For in the address[4] which he delivered before the bishops of the Council of Douzi (August 871), Charles showed that

Council of Attigny, 870.

[1] "Continetur . . . . in petitione ab ecclesia Laudunensi exiguitati meæ oblata, te prohibuisse nulli communionem, nec etiam obeunti ultimam pœnitentiam, vel viaticum munus in parochia tua tribui," etc. (Ep. Hinc. Rh., *ib.*, p. 513. *Cf.* Ep. ad Clerum Laud., ap. Labbe, viii. 1789).

[2] Before September 7, 869, the day of Charles's coronation as king of Lorraine. For whatever reason, Hincmar of Laon alone would not recognise Charles as king of his late nephew's kingdom.

[3] "Obsecro (Hincmarus Laud.) quo . . . . obtineatis quatenus . . . . Hadriani præceptis, ... velut ei qui de omni ecclesia fas habet judicandi liceat obedire." Labbe, viii. 1527.

[4] Already quoted (Labbe, viii. 1552). On one occasion even "ubi et domni apostolici missi, et archiepiscopus ejus fuit, nihil inde loquutus est."

on no less than five occasions when 'Laon' was with him, in the interval between the two councils, he never spoke of his wish to go to Rome.

Council of Douzi, 871.

But if Bishop Hincmar had no thought of turning to Rome, his uncle had. He wrote about the affair to the Pope, and received a letter[1] from him, addressed to Hincmar of Laon, in which that bishop was blamed for not fulfilling his vow of making a pilgrimage to Rome, and ordered to obey his metropolitan, saving the rights of the Holy See. More angry than ever with 'Laon' for his taking part with his rebellious son Carloman, and getting him into trouble with the Pope on account of the same youth,[2] Charles, in August 871, convoked another synod to meet at Douzi, near Mouson, a place famous in the story of the battle of Sedan (1870), in order to try the artful bishop. 'Laon' was summoned to the synod by Hincmar, "in virtue of the authority of the Pope,"[3] by a notice dated July 5, the fourth indiction (871).

At the synod 'Laon' fell back on his old plan; he appealed to the Apostolic See. But this could not save him. He was declared deposed, "saving in all things the decision of the Apostolic See," as was proclaimed as well by the first bishop[4] (Hardwick of Besançon) who recorded his vote against 'Laon,' as by Hincmar[5] of Rheims in passing sentence on him.

Hadrian's confirmation of the council asked.

The acts of the council were forthwith sent to Hadrian by Actard of Nantes, and along with them a synodal letter dated September 6, 871. The letter set forth in brief the

[1] Ep. "Solicitudine pastorali" (Labbe, viii. 1635).

[2] Of this hereafter.

[3] Labbe, viii. p. 1553. "Auctoritate ipsius domni apostolici, te . . . . ad synodum . . . . venire commoneo."

[4] Labbe, viii. 1646.

[5] "Reservato per omnia juris privilegio domni Hadriani." *Ib.*, p. 1652.

charges on the strength of which the bishops had condemned 'Laon,' "saving in all things the decision of the Apostolic See, as the sacred Canons of Sardica, and, from them, the decrees of Popes Innocent, Boniface and Leo have laid down."[1] Hadrian is earnestly begged to confirm the sentence of the synod. Here it would have been best for the obtaining of their wishes if the letter had ended. The bishops, however, and especially Hincmar of Rheims, were so angry at the tergiversations of 'Laon,' who seemed so obviously guilty, that they not unnaturally could ill brook the thought of the crafty bishop's being able to get the whole affair taken out of their hands, and of his enjoying still further immunity meanwhile. They, therefore, proceeded to tell the Pope what he must do in case he did not agree with their decision—a thing they did not expect. In conformity with the Canons of Sardica, he should order a fresh trial by the bishops on the spot, or send legates *a latere* to decide the case along with the bishops. In any case, "with all humility of devotion," they beg the Pope not to restore 'Laon' to his rank in the meanwhile, till the case has been again gone into in the province in which it had been already decided. Such has hitherto, their letter continued, been the universally received method of procedure in the Gallic and Belgic Churches. As they are anxious for the preservation of the privileges of the See of Peter, they beg the Pope to have a care of theirs. But if, by some means or other, 'Laon' should be restored to his see by the Pope, then, said the bishops, "under favour,"[2] 'Laon' will be able to do, what he has

[1] "Judicia terminavimus, reservato per omnia juris privilegio apostolicæ sedis ac vestro judicio sicut sacri canones Sardicenses, et decreta sedis apostolicæ pontificum . . . . decernunt." The synodal letter to Pope Hadrian. *Ib.*, p. 1656.

[2] "Ut cum venia vestra dicamus." *Ib.*, p. 1657.

all along wanted to do, viz. as he likes, and it will only remain for them to leave him alone.[1]

He will not confirm it, 871.

Whether Hadrian was annoyed at the pettiness displayed in the conclusion of the synodal letter, whether he was in possession of facts which are unknown to us, whether he was afraid of establishing a precedent if, under the circumstances, he confirmed the synod, or whether, in fine, he was simply ill-advised, certain it is that he refused to confirm the synod (December 26, 871). As Hincmar of Laon had appealed to Rome, he, with one of his accusers, must come to Rome, where the affair would be considered in a synod.[2] Till then no bishop must be consecrated for the See of Laon. In another letter, addressed to the king, while attempting to soothe his anger at the letter of expostulation which he had sent him (July 13, 871) on the subject of his treatment of Carloman, the Pope declares that "as long as he lives"[3] he will not confirm the synod till 'Laon' comes to Rome. Irritated as the recipients of these letters were at the trouble which 'Laon' had given them, the papal documents were viewed with no little disfavour. The bishops wrote back to the Pope to say that they were astonished at the letter they had received; but that, as Actard[4] had informed them of the important matters on which the Pope and his officials were fully engaged, they supposed that the one whom he had directed to write to them had not read, in their entirety, the acts of their synod, or he never could have written as he had done. The conclusion of this letter is wanting. If the tone of the

[1] Actard was also the bearer of a letter of Hincmar of Rheims (*ib.*, or *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 641) and one from the king on the same matter. *Cf.* Epp. 7, 8, 9 of Charles, ap. *P. L.*, t. 124, p. 876 f.

[2] Labbe, viii. 932.

[3] Labbe, viii. 934.

[4] Actardi "relatione impedimenta vestræ sanctitatis, et occupationes ministrorum sedis ap. pro diversis et maximis negotiis audivimus." Labbe, *ib.*, 1539.

answer of the bishops was somewhat sharp, those of Charles the Bald,[1] in which all recognise the hand of Hincmar,[2] were absolutely violent. He professes at first to believe that the language of the Pope's letters to him is due to the one to whom he had entrusted the drawing of them up; but in a following letter he says he has found they have come from the Pope himself. He then launches forth. He complains[3] of being set down as perjured and tyrannical, though he has neither confessed to the charges urged against him nor been proved to have been guilty of them. And though he does not deny, in general, the Pope's right to excommunicate anyone whomsoever, still he strongly resents the threat of excommunication which, without any grounds, has been hurled against him. If the Pope wants the king to pay any heed to his recommendations, he must

[1] Epp. 7–9, ap. *P. L.*, t. 124, p. 881.

[2] Because, when crossed, Hincmar said, or caused things to be said, to the Pope, which were not altogether seemly, some have wished to infer that he was desirous to create a *national* church, and did not completely acknowledge the Pope's supremacy. Hence the following passages from his works or letters against 'Laon' himself may be worth noting. If the metropolitans have rights: "sollicitudo et primatus totius Ecclesiæ catholicæ sanctæ sedis Romanæ pontifici *divinitus* est collata." Ep. ad Hinc. Laud., ap *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 509. In another letter to the same (*ib.*, p. 510) he says: "Nam ego decretales epistolas sedis apostolicæ . . . . et venerabiliter suscipio, et venerabiliter suscipiendas dico et scribo." To Hincmar the Pope is "patriarcha patriarcharum et primas primatum cunctarum provinciarum . . . . . B. Petrus . . . . *primatum judiciariæ potestatis* . . . . accepit, et *in primatu illius successores ipsius* in sede ejus *acceperunt*; ut omnes per orbem *credentes* intelligant, quia *quicunque* ab unitate fidei, vel *societatis illius quolibet modo semetipsos segregant*, tales nec *vinculis peccatorum absolvi*, nec januam possunt regni celestis ingredi." Those not of the Church, but who profess to reverence the opinions of Hincmar of Rheims, may well reflect on this last passage. *Ib.*, pp. 609, 610.

[3] "Cum non ignoremus ex sacrarum Scripturarum tramite et doctrina apostolicæ sedis pontificum, unde et qualiter ac quomodo et quo ordine, *quamquam*, pontifex quilibet debeat regulariter excommunicare." Ep. 7. Ep. 8 makes the same complaint as Ep. 7. Three letters, Epp. 7–9, were sent in all.

write in the style in which the popes have been wont to address the kings of France. The Pope is then roundly lectured as to what he ought to have done, and asked to bear with the king's plain-speaking, as St. Peter, "the first Pope," endured the hard words of St. Paul. "What hell," he continues, forcibly at least, "has vomited forth this general law?"[1] viz., that one (Hincmar of Laon) should be sent to Rome who had been a prevaricator of the sacred laws, a reviler of the holy priesthood, a despiser of his sovereign, a disturber of the kingdom, etc. Any condemnation that does not proceed "from a just judgment of Peter" (*ex æquitate Petri*) is not to be held as of any account. A king cannot be ordered to send to Rome a man who has been legally condemned as guilty. As for looking after the property of the Church of Laon during the absence of its bishop, Charles would beg to remind the Pope that the kings of the Franks were not stewards of bishops, but rulers of the State. But in any case 'Laon' shall not have the temporalities (*episcopium*) of his See, even if it has been impossible to arrive at the truth with regard to all the accusations which have been brought against him. Any of his clerics may, however, go to Rome. But the Pope is not to allow orders and excommunications, against the canons, to be sent in his name to the king. If opportunity presents itself, he will come to Rome himself as an accuser of 'Laon,' but he will bring more witnesses with him than the Pope will care for.[2] He will not, however, be backward in rendering him, as the vicar of the Prince of the Apostles,

[1] "Quis igitur hanc universam legem infernus evomuit?" Ep. 8.

[2] "Ep. 8, ap. *P. L.*, t. 124. "Et tantos testes idoneos diversi ordinis ac dignitatis nobiscum ducemus, cum quibus eum legaliter ac regulariter nos accusasse ac comprobasse sufficientissime comprobabimus!" In a short letter which Charles sent along with the above, he declared that he had not written *contumaciter*, but in a pacific spirit! In the text we have combined two letters—Epp. 7 and 8. The latter is of true Hincmarian length.

the obedience to which he is legally entitled. He will not send derogatory letters if he does not receive them.

This blustering epistle had the effect of making Hadrian see that it was necessary to pour oil on the troubled waters. A letter[1] despatched at once, not many months before he died, praised the king's wisdom, justice, and zeal for the Church of God, assured him of his consequent attachment to him, and declared that, if in his former letters the king had found objectionable phrases, they must have come from him when tortured by sickness, or have been inserted by others. Then, as a secret only to be made known to those who were absolutely trustworthy, Hadrian assured the king that if he survived the emperor, and he himself were still alive, he would never, not even for gold untold, acknowledge any other as emperor except Charles.[2] With regard to Hincmar of Laon, the Pope acknowledged that, from the evidence sent him, things looked black indeed against him. But it would be against the canons for him to decide anything, under the circumstances, against 'Laon' until he had been to Rome. If he there still maintained his innocence, the Pope would then authorise a new trial in 'Laon's' own province.

'Laon,' however, was not allowed to go to Rome, but was put into prison instead. After about two years' imprisonment, the unfortunate man was deprived of his sight,[3] for what cause we have not been able to discover. Just before leaving Rome, after his coronation (January 5, 876) as

Laon and John VIII.

[1] Labbe, viii. 937.

[2] "Confitemur . . . . quod si superstes ei (Ludovico) fuerit vestra nobilitas, vita nobis comite, ... nunquam acquiescemus, exposcemus, aut sponte suscipiemus alium in regnum et imperium Romanum, nisi teipsum." *Ib.*, p. 938.

[3] According to the contemporary author of the *Annals of S. Vedast* (a monastery in the diocese of Cambrai), 'Laon' was blinded by Boso, Charles's brother-in-law. *Cf.* 'Laon's' own statement made before the Council of Troyes (third session. Labbe, *Conc.*, ix.).

emperor by John VIII., Charles obtained from him the confirmation[1] of the Synod of Douzi, and his consent to the election of a new bishop for the See of Laon. One Hedenulf was accordingly duly elected (March 876). But when John came to France and held a synod at Troyes (August 878), the poor degraded Hincmar, blind but dauntless still, came before him and appealed for justice.[2] According to the contemporary chronicler of St. Vedast's monastery (ad an. 878), he completely cleared himself of all the charges brought against him. And we know from Hincmar himself[3] that, on the motion of several bishops, John, with the consent of the king ('Laon's' enemy, the Emperor Charles the Bald, was now dead, and Louis the Stammerer was king), decided that Hedenulf was to keep the bishopric of Laon, but that the unhappy blind bishop might say mass, and have part of the episcopal revenues. Thus was this tiresome affair[4] brought to an end. But its tragic development in the blinding of the unfortunate bishop, and the consideration that he may very easily have been—nay, indeed, probably was—less guilty than he was made to appear by king and archbishop, might well justify the Holy See in being slow to consent to the deposition of bishops, especially where there was question of a king powerful enough to force his own will. It was action of this kind on the part of rulers, ecclesiastical and civil, which caused the eighth ecumenical council to decree that the causes of bishops were in future to be reserved to their patriarchs only, and no longer left to the judgment

[1] John grants this because, from the king's account, "agnovimus justum fuisse omnino judicium." Ep. 17, ap. *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 662. *Cf.* Epp. 51, 52 Hinc. Rhem., *ib.*, p. 270 f.

[2] *Cf.* 'Laon's' statement; and *Annal. Ved.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 517.

[3] *Annal.*, ad an. 878.

[4] On it, see Hefele, *Conc.*, v. 600; vi. 63 f. (Fr. ed.); Jager, *Hist. de l'Église de France*, v.; Jungmann, *Diss.*, xvi.

of their metropolitan or of the bishops of their province (can. 26).

Well was it for Europe in the Middle Ages that there was a power which could put a check on the tyranny of kings. No lover of liberty should murmur at the authority boldly exercised by the Popes. Even if they did occasionally overstep their powers, their actions were almost universally on the side of right and freedom. And when they were not, they did not issue in the cruel deeds of 'blood and iron' (such as the treatment of 'Laon') perpetrated by kings, when they overstepped the rights which were their due from the laws of God and man.

Political events. The death of Lothaire. Partition of his kingdom.

The case against the younger Hincmar was, it would seem, rendered stronger by his political action. Hence some even suppose that he lost his eyes for siding with Louis the German, who attempted to cause a rising in Charles's kingdom of Neustria, when that prince had gone to Rome to receive the imperial crown (875). Charles and Louis were perpetually either making war on each other, or coming to some amicable, but very temporary, understanding. On the death of the dissolute Lothaire II., king of Lorraine (August 8, 869), his kingdom ought to have fallen to his brother, the Emperor Louis II. When their third brother, Charles, had died (863), his kingdom, which consisted of Provence and the 'Duchy of Lyons,' had been satisfactorily divided between the Emperor Louis II. and Lothaire II. of Lorraine. But on the demise of the latter, his uncles, Charles the Bald and Louis the German, without any consideration for the emperor, divided his kingdom between them. By a treaty concluded between the pair at Mersen, near Maestricht (August 870), the exact share of each was finally determined. The Moselle and the lower reaches of the Meuse may be said to have formed the boundaries between the two kingdoms,

which were still further divided by language. Speaking generally, the realm of Louis the German was the abode of the Teutonic tongue, that of Charles, of the Romance or French.

Hadrian saves the kingdom of Lothaire from invasion, 868.

Long before this final arrangement was concluded, Hadrian stood out for the rights of the emperor. He was the more moved to this from the fact that Louis was making determined efforts to drive the Saracens out of Southern Italy. Indeed, he had not been Pope many months before he began to work for the maintenance of the existing political order. Even though Lothaire of Lorraine was then naturally in bad odour in Rome, still when Hadrian heard that Louis the German was hoping to make capital out of his nephew's ill-favour by invading his country, he wrote to beg him not to do so. Such action would be fatal to the Church. Louis was doing his utmost, not sparing himself in anything, to overcome "those foes of the name of Christ" the Saracens. But if his brother were touched he would feel himself injured also, and the good he was doing would be suspended.[1] Similar letters were sent to Charles the Bald.[2]

It was only to be expected, therefore, that, on Lothaire's death, Hadrian would exert himself in the interests of the emperor. And loyally did he do so. The emperor and the Pope were now harmoniously working for each other's benefit. Four letters, three of them dated September 5, 869, were at once despatched from Rome. The dated ones were addressed respectively to the bishops, and to the lay lords of Charles the Bald, and to Hincmar of Rheims. They were all earnestly exhorted to warn Charles from seizing what belonged, by hereditary right, to the emperor, the defender of the Church against the

[1] Ep. 12, ap. Labbe, viii. 908, dated February 12, 868.
[2] Hinc., *Annal.*, ad an. 868.

Saracens.[1] Those who should give any contrary advice were threatened with excommunication. The remaining letter,[2] on the other hand, was addressed to the clerical and lay nobility of the kingdom of Lorraine, who were solemnly urged to remain true to the emperor.

Charles crowned King of Lorraine 869.

But before the bishops, Paul and Leo, who were the bearers of these letters, and the imperial envoy could reach Gaul, Charles had had himself crowned at Metz[3] as king of Lorraine (September 9, 869), and the embassy was unable to effect anything. To begin with, it was the intention of Charles to keep the whole of Lorraine for himself. But Louis the German had to be reckoned with; and he soon found that the only way to avoid war was to induce Louis to share the plunder. That any such agreement had been come to was quite unknown to Hadrian, when in June (870) he sent off a more numerous embassy with letters (dated June 27)[4] for both Louis and Charles. The latter is severely blamed for his perjury in occupying the kingdom which belonged to the Emperor Louis, and this against his oath, of which the Pope has the deed,[5] and also for sending away the legates without addressing suitable answers to them or to the Apostolic See. We are very willing, continued the Pope, to do as you suggest, and to act as a mediator between you and the emperor. Indeed, we have begun to do so. But, even in order that peace may be made, you refuse to give way to him who is

[1] There was then such danger from the Saracens, that an irruption into the states of the Church was to be feared "ita ut etiam fines nostros infestatio propemodum Sarracenorum invaderet." Ep. 20 Had., Labbe, viii. 918.

[2] Ep. 19. [3] *Annal. Fuld. et Hinc.*, ad an.

[4] The letters, six in number, are all dated in Labbe, viii. 922 f., "Data v. Kalendas Julii," which would give June 27.

[5] "Numquid a mente excidit, quod vestra vestrorumque juramenta sedi apostolicæ destinata . . . . roboravimus et in archivo nostro hodie illa recondita retinemus." Ep. 23 ad Car.

fighting the battles of the Lord against the Saracens. It is only because he is so engaged that you dare do what you have done. To show that we are acting not with any hope of favour from men, we will not leave your conduct unpunished, even if the emperor should be disposed so to do. The aged Pope even talked of himself going to Charles, if his letters failed to make him do his duty. He commended to the king his legates, viz. four bishops and a priest 'cardinis nostri.'

In accordance with instructions received from the Pope,[1] his envoys went first to Louis the German, in whose goodwill towards the emperor both the Pope and Louis II. himself had full confidence,[2] to concert measures with him for dealing with Charles. When, however, the envoys reached Louis the German, they found that he had also become a partner in the unjust spoliation of the emperor. Without giving them any satisfaction, he sent them on to Charles. Charles kept them for some time with him; and though he did not accede to the desire of the Pope, he sent him presents and letters by ambassadors of his own, and, at the request of the legates, set free from custody[3] his son Carloman. The papal envoys, then, had to return and report to the Pope that they had failed to accomplish anything. Something, however, they had done. For two years afterwards, Louis the German gave up his share of the plunder to the emperor.[4]

A letter from Hincmar.

Among the letters brought to the Pope by his legates was, no doubt, the one[5] which Hincmar of Rheims had written in answer to one (of September 5, 869) he had received from the Pope, instructing him to oppose Charles's intended usurpation. As its object was to

[1] Ep. 27.
[2] Ep. 27 ad Lud., ap. Labbe, viii. 928.
[3] Hinc., *Annal.*, ad an. 870.
[4] *Ib.*, an. 872.
[5] Ep. 27, ap. *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 174 f.

defend a very weak case, it took a very high tone. While professing[1] that, to avoid the Pope's censures, he had not shrunk from doing as he had been instructed, Hincmar launched forth some very hard blows. His strong words, however, he presented, not as his own, but as the remarks of "both clergy and laity who had assembled at Rheims in great numbers from the different kingdoms." The burden of the epistle was to the effect that Charles had acted as he had from necessity. The dreaded Normans were near, and the Emperor Louis was far away. A sentence or two will show its tone. When, wrote Hincmar, I spoke of the power which had been given by Our Lord to St. Peter, the first of His apostles, and through him to his successors, and to the apostles and their successors, the bishops, "they replied: 'Do you then by the sole power of your prayers defend the kingdom against the Normans and its other foes, and seek not our help. But if you want to have our armed assistance, as we desire the protection of your prayers, seek not what is to our loss, but ask the Pope (as he cannot be king and bishop at once, and as his predecessors have regulated ecclesiastical affairs, which are their business, and not state matters, which are the business of kings) not to command us to have a king, who, so far away, cannot help us against the sudden and frequent attacks of the heathens, nor to order us, Franks, to be submissive; for such a yoke have his predecessors never laid upon ours, nor can we suffer it.'"

Charles and his son Carloman.

One of the causes which kept Charles irritated against Hincmar of Laon was his supporting against him the above-mentioned Carloman. Wisely determining not to imitate,

[1] "Igitur qui me a solida unitatis catholicæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ petra non divido, et, sicut nostis, scriptis et etiam præsentibus vestris missis, adeo ex vestra jussione verbis restiti regi, ac regnorum primoribus, ut et coram eisdem missis comminaretur mihi," etc. *Ib.*

at least to the full, the fatal example of his predecessors, Charles the Bald destined only two of his sons to reign after him. The other two, of whom one was Carloman, were made monks. But, as Charles thought nothing of sending Carloman on military expeditions,[1] he ought not to have been surprised to find that his son soon got tired of a monastic life, and even commenced hatching plots against him. For this he was at once incarcerated in Senlis,[2] after the Synod of Attigny had deprived him of the abbeys which the king had bestowed upon him. Through the intercession of the legates sent by Hadrian to induce Charles to leave for his nephew the kingdom of Lorraine, Carloman was released from confinement. But he only made use of his liberty to renew his plots. Supported by Hincmar of Laon, Carloman laid his own version of the case before the Pope. "Hadrian," writes Pertz,[3] "stirred up by the appeal, and deceived by the envoys sent by the wicked prince, and, moreover, angry with Charles on account of his seizing the kingdom of Lorraine, took up the cause with alacrity." He wrote to Charles (July, 13 871) to accuse him of adding cruelty to robbery. "Surpassing the ferocity of the beasts, you do not blush to turn against your own flesh and blood, against your son Carloman." Hadrian goes on to ask the king to restore the youth to favour, at least until his envoys

[1] Hinc., *Annal.*, 868. [2] Hinc., *Annal.*, 870.

[3] *Cf.* his note to Hinc., *Annal.*, 871, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 491. We quote these words of the illustrious Pertz, along with the important parts of this short letter, to show with what considerable modifications this remark of Alzog (*Universal Ch. Hist.*, ii. 205) must be accepted. "It is to be regretted that this pontiff lessened, in some degree, the high consideration in which the apostolic authority was then held, by *taking under his protection* Carloman, the rebellious son of Charles the Bald, who, besides being a renegade monk, was on the point of incurring the sentence of excommunication for his shameful vices, and by the bitter and fruitless struggle which he brought upon himself by espousing the cause of Hincmar, bishop of Laon, against his uncle, Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims."

come to the king, and, "saving the honour which is due to both of you," until the affair may be settled on the observed merits of the case.[1]

To the nobles of Charles's kingdom he wrote to urge them to do all that lay in their power to prevent the scandal of father and son from fighting against each other, and to threaten with excommunication whoever took up arms against Carloman. By a third letter, to the bishops of France (Neustria) and Lorraine, again supposing things to be as stated to him, he forbids them to excommunicate Carloman "until we, who wish the judgments of God's priests to be carefully considered, find out the truth with regard to all that has happened." He concludes by saying very pointedly that, though Carloman has assured[2] him of his innocence over and over again, he may not be guiltless. But it would look like a just judgment of God, that the one who had done such wrong to his own nephew should be punished by having a rebellious son.

According to Hincmar,[3] before the end of this year (871), Carloman, with "a feigned profession of submission," gave himself up into the hands of his father, who again caused him to be imprisoned in Senlis. By this time Hadrian was in a better position to judge of his aims, and henceforth we hear no more of papal interference in behalf of the young prince, who was, by a council at Senlis (873) degraded from the clerical state to which he had never voluntarily aspired. When, however, it was found that the malcontents then more than ever turned to Carloman, "in order that he might have an opportunity of doing penance,"[4] and yet at the same time might be prevented

[1] Ep. 29 (Labbe, viii. 929). *Cf.* Epp. 30 and 31, to the nobles and bishops.

[2] "Præfatus Carolomannus insontem quidem se circa patrem multipliciter asserit." Ep. 31.

[3] *Annal.*, ad an. 871.

[4] *Ib.*, 873.

from disturbing the peace of the kingdom, the death-penalty, which was decided to be his due, was commuted to the loss of sight. The Annals of Fulda do not put the affair so well for the king as does his friend Hincmar. They state laconically: "Charles the tyrant (*tyrannus*) of Gaul, laying aside all parental feeling, commanded his son Carloman to be blinded."[1] The unhappy young man died soon after.

The Emperor Louis II. and the Saracens.

In the last few pages mention has often been made of the wars of the Emperor Louis II. against the Saracens. To events in connection with them we must now turn. The story of the Saracens' effecting a firm foothold in Italy has already[2] been told. Before the emperor, who has been justly called the 'Saviour of Italy,' could turn his undivided attention to the work of driving out the Saracens, he had to bring to a close the rivalry between Radelchis and Siconulf. It may be remembered that these were the men who, in their struggle for the duchy of Beneventum, had both called in Saracens to their aid. In 850 (or perhaps rather in 849) Louis forced the two to make peace. Radelchis was to keep Beneventum itself, and the eastern half of the duchy. Siconulf became *Prince* of Salerno, and ruled over the Campanian and Lucanian[3] half. Henceforth, among the Lombards of the south, the dukes of Beneventum will only be second to the princes of Salerno, which had for some time been rapidly increasing in commercial importance, and to the counts of Capua, lords of the valley of the Liris, who had come into power by breaking away from Siconulf, just as he had rendered himself independent of Radelchis. Later on (867), the emperor compelled them to do him homage, and to lend him their

[1] Ad an. 873 (*M. G. SS.*, i. 385). [2] *Supra*, vol. ii. 214.
[3] *Chron. Vultur.*, ap. *R. I. S.*, I., ii. p. 390. *Cf.* Gay, *L'Italie Méridionale*, p. 62.

assistance against Mofareg-ibn-Salem, who had formed into one state the whole coast from Bari, which the Saracens had seized in 840, to Reggio. For eighteen years (853–71) this robber-king was the terror of Southern Italy.[1] Louis also secured a half-hearted co-operation of the Greeks. Despite certain reverses, after one of which, to the great grief[2] of the emperor himself and of the Pope, the infidels were able to make a dash, and plunder the celebrated abbey of St. Michael on Mt. Gargano, Louis took Bari, the head-quarters of the Saracen occupation (February 871). Leaving his army to continue the work of ousting the Saracens, he withdrew to Beneventum. Whether it was that he yearned for the spoils which Louis had with him, or whether rendered furious by the avaricious haughtiness of the Empress Ingelberga,[3] the new Duke Adelgisus (Adelchis) attempted to seize his sovereign. He was successful; but, terrified by a fresh invasion of Saracens (September 871), he released him and his friends, on his oath that he would never attempt to avenge the insult that had been put upon him. This outrage on the imperial dignity, taken in conjunction with those put upon the papal at the beginning of Hadrian's reign, serves to bring out in still clearer light the rapidly growing insolence of the greater nobles, and to prepare us to find both dignities still further degraded by lawless barons.

The feelings of indignation with which Louis left Beneventum can be well imagined. The duke of Spoleto fled from before him to his associate Adelgisus. Burning to avenge the insult put upon him, he sent to beg the Pope

[1] Oman, *Europe*, 476–918. [2] Hinc., *Annal.*, an. 869.

[3] According to Hincmar (an. 871), Adalgisus discovered that, through the action of the empress's party, Louis was about to banish him. According to Erchempert, whose sympathies would be with the Lombards, "Galli graviter Beneventanos persequi ac crudeliter vexare" (*Hist. Lang.*, c. 34)—a course of action not altogether foreign to the 'Galli.'

to come and meet him, and absolve him from the oath he had taken.[1]

Louis crowned at Rome, 872.

It would seem, however, that he was absolved from his oath only when he came to Rome for the Whitsuntide[2] of 872. At least, the monk Regino, in his chronicle, assigns that act of supreme jurisdiction on the part of the Pope to the time when Louis came to Rome, though he wrongly attributes its performance to Pope John VIII. He says: "In the year of our Lord's incarnation 872, the Emperor Louis came to Rome, and there in an assembly (*conventum celebrans*) he laid his complaints against Adelgisus in presence of the Pope. Then, by the senate of the Romans, Adelgisus was declared a tyrant and an enemy of the republic, and war was decreed against him. By the authority of God and St. Peter, Pope John (Hadrian) absolved the emperor from the oath he had taken, saying that what he had done under compulsion, to avoid the danger of death, was not binding, and that that could not be called an oath which was devised against the safety of the republic."[3]

On the day of Pentecost (May 18) Louis was crowned by the Pope, doubtless as king of that portion of Lothaire's kingdom which Louis the German had restored to him, and after Mass rode, in company with the Pope, in great state to the Lateran.[4]

Louis is reconciled to Adelgisus, 873.

Before he left Rome, the entreaties of the holy bishop of

[1] "Mandans apostolico Adriano, ut obviam illi in transitu itineris sui veniret, quatenus de ipso sacramento illum et suos absolveret." Hincmar, *ib.*

[2] *Ib.*

[3] *In Chron.*, an. 872, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 584. At this time Regino (†915) was probably a very young man, and he certainly wrote his chronicle at a distance from the scene of these events (he wrote in the monastery of St. Gall in Switzerland); so that we must suppose that he described these doings in classical terms with which he was familiar, and had no thought of using 'senate' as though, at this period, there was anything in Rome equivalent to the 'senate' of the old republic.

[4] Hinc. an. 872.

Naples, Athanasius, induced Louis to at least suspend his desire of vengeance against the duke of Beneventum, and to turn his arms on those Saracens[1] whose landing had been the cause of his release. And next year, because, according to some authorities, he felt himself unable to chastise Adelgisus, he allowed Pope John VIII. to reconcile him with the duke.[2] But there was no real submission in the heart of the Lombard.

St. Athanasius of Naples.

Athanasius, the saintly prelate of whom mention has just been made, was, at the time of which we are now writing (872), in exile. Uncle of the Duke Sergius of Naples, he had been put in prison for reproving the young prince's evil courses. The clamours of the people, however, forced the duke to release him from confinement. But he ceased not to oppress him, and to hinder him in his work in every way. The saint, therefore, left Naples (871), and took refuge in the Isle of the Saviour, about a mile and a half from the city. Sergius would have brought him back by main force, had not the emperor sent out troops for his delivery. Rendered furious by being thus baulked, Sergius plundered the episcopal treasury, and treated the ecclesiastics in Naples with the greatest barbarity. In two letters, which are now lost, Hadrian wrote to him and to the clergy and people of Naples, ordering them, under pain of excommunication, to receive back their bishop.[3] When no notice of these letters was taken by the duke, Hadrian,

[1] "Multis precibus ab eo extorsit (Athanasius) ut suæ immemor injuriæ, suffragaret Salernitanis, Hishmahëlitum obsidione ballatis." Johan. Diac., *in vit. Epp. Neap.*, ap. *R. I. S.*, I., ii., p. 317.

[2] Hinc., an. 873. The fullest account of all these events is to be found in Gay, *l. c.*

[3] *Cf.* the *life* of St. Athanasius by Peter, a subdeacon of the Church of Naples, ii. § 24, ap. *Acta SS.*, Julii iv., 83. According to Muratori (*R. I. S.*, I., ii. p. 289 f.), John the deacon, and Peter the subdeacon, who both wrote lives of this saint, were both his contemporaries. The *life* by Peter is also to be read in *R. I. S.*, ii., p. ii.

through the librarian, Cardinal Anastasius, laid the city under an interdict. But the thought that his episcopal city was in this sad condition was more than Athanasius could long bear. At his entreaty, Hadrian removed the interdict. The saint's death (July 15, 872) alone prevented the Emperor Louis from restoring him to his See. This sketch of the history of St. Athanasius of Naples furnishes us with another view of one of the innumerable petty tyrants into whose hands, strong in nothing but evil, all power in Western Europe was now falling. A great and powerful tyrant who lords it over an extended empire stifles liberty, but a number of petty tyrannical princes rend it to pieces.

Restoration of S. Ignatius, 867.

Some little space must now be devoted to the narration of the most important story, not only in the reign of Hadrian, but in the ninth century, viz., that of the would-be patriarch of Constantinople, Photius. It has been put off to the end of this biography, that, taken up again in the beginning of the *life* of John VIII., there may be as few great gaps as possible between its different parts.

It has been already[1] stated that Nicholas I. had died before official news reached Rome that the Emperor Michael had been assassinated, and that his quondam groom, Basil the Macedonian, was emperor of Constantinople in his stead. Despite the means by which he raised himself to the supreme power, Basil proved a good emperor, and founded the longest of the Byzantine dynasties—a dynasty which gave to the Greek empire at least 'stationary prosperity.'[2]

[1] *Supra*, p. 67.

[2] The Basilian dynasty lasted from 867 to 1056. *Cf.* Oman, *Europe*, 476-918. Finlay also avers (*The Byzantine Empire*, 716–1057), p. 233, that the family of Basil "reigned at Constantinople for two centuries, with greater power and glory than the Eastern Empire had attained since the days of Justinian."

The first act of any importance which Basil performed was, "in accordance with the sentence of the Roman Church," to banish Photius, the intruded patriarch[1] (September 25). This he did on the day following that on which he had himself been saluted as emperor. By his orders, also, the envoy, Zachary, was recalled, who had been made metropolitan of Chalcedon by Photius, and who was on his way to Italy to convey to Louis and Ingelberga the forged acts of the petty council which Photius had held (867) against Pope Nicholas,[2] and forged acts against St. Ignatius. Photius's papers, too, which he tried to smuggle out of his palace, were also seized; and it was then that copies of the forged acts of a council[3] against Ignatius, and of one against Pope Nicholas, which Photius had entrusted to Zachary, were all also secured.

Recall of S. Ignatius, 867.

The day following the expulsion of Photius, "moved

[1] Basil was proclaimed emperor, September 24, 867 (*cf.* Nicetas, *in vit. Ignat.*, ap. Labbe, viii. 1225). Some authors, following the Latin translation, which is here inaccurate, write the 23rd of September. It is not a little extraordinary to find Finlay (*ib.*, pp. 274–5), who blames Jager for his inaccuracies in his *Life* of Photius, making Photius remain in office for two years after the accession of Basil, and stating that the accusation of forgery against Photius rested *only* on some *slight* changes which had been made in the translation of the Pope's letter to the emperor, *i.e.* of Nicholas to Michael. *Cf. L. P.*, n. xxii.

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 65. Nicetas, ap. Labbe, viii. pp. 1224–5–8.

[3] *Ib.* "Alterum (one of the forged volumes) continebat actiones septem synodicas contra Ignatium, quæ nec sunt, nec fuerunt unquam celebratæ, sed gratis astuta mente confictæ." The other was the forgery against Pope Nicholas. All the four volumes were exposed to the public gaze at Constantinople, the Acts against Nicholas were sent to Rome to show Pope Hadrian, and then all the rest were burnt in presence of Photius in the eighth session of the Eighth General Council. Besides Nicetas, consult the acts of the eighth session; Anastasius, in his preface to the eighth General Council; the *life* of Hadrian (c. 25 f.); Metrophanes (ap. Labbe, viii. 1390), who adds that, when the acts were exposed to view, all maintained stoutly that they knew nothing about them; and Stylian (*ib.*, 1402). Than the fabrication of these impudent forgeries by Photius, there is no better authenticated fact in history. *Cf.* also *infra*, pp. 194, 196.

by the prayers of all the people,"[1] Basil "confirmed the decision (πρᾶξιν) come to in Old Rome by Pope Nicholas concerning the expulsion of Photius and the restoration of Ignatius, recalled Ignatius from exile, and degraded Photius"[2]—an item of news, to use the expression of the monk Michael, "received with the greatest joy by the prelates of the other apostolic thrones."

Letters of Basil to Rome.

Basil lost no time in communicating with Rome, and in sending word of what had been done to Pope *Nicholas*, of whose death, on December 11, the emperor was still unacquainted. Of the two letters which he sent to Rome, the first is lost, but the second[3] (dated December 11) has come down to us. He tells the Pope, whom he addresses as the "head, sacred, divine, and reverend, like Aaron," that he is sending him a second letter, for fear that, owing to the great distance which separates them, some accident might prevent the first from being delivered into his hands. He goes on to speak of the wretched state in which he found the Church of Constantinople when he took the reins of government, and to say that he had taken certain remedial measures himself, and had left the rest to be done by the Pope. He had removed Photius from the patriarchal See because he had acted against the truth and against the Pope.[4] Ignatius, on the other hand, he had recalled in virtue of the decision contained in the Pope's letters—letters which his predecessors had kept secret. It is for the Pope to settle the other questions; nay, to approve what he had himself accomplished.[5] He wishes him to decide

[1] *Encomium Ig.*, ap. Labbe, viii. 1262.

[2] Stylian, *ib.*, 1402. *Cf.* Nicetas. [3] Labbe, viii. 1007.

[4] "Quippe qui multa contra veritatem, et contra sacrum pontificium vestrum commovit." *Ib.*

[5] Ignatius . . . . secundum judicium et justificationem, quæ in diversis epistolis vestris inventa est (quamquam per easdem literas vix nunc omnibus manifestum constituimus; sic enim ipsæ literæ obrutæ, et nullatenus quibusdam ostensæ fuerint ab iis qui ante nos principatum

what has to be done with those—the great majority—who through violence, fraud, levity, or bribes have been false to Ignatius and have gone over to Photius. "That the Pope's divine and apostolic sentence may be made known even to the party of Photius," he is sending to Rome John, the metropolitan of Silæum, to represent Ignatius; Peter, the metropolitan of Sardis, for Photius and, on his own behalf, the spathar Basil. In conclusion, he begs Nicholas to act promptly, that the fold of Christ (of which he is the chief minister and immolator—*immolator*) may again become one, obeying one pastor.

By the 1st of August 868 (if there is no mistake in the dates or addresses of the two letters which we are about to quote), neither the last-mentioned letter of Basil, nor the embassy therein spoken of, had reached Rome. For the Pope, in two letters of that date, simply praises[1] Basil for what he has done in the matter of Photius and Ignatius, rallies the latter in a friendly way for not writing to him about the state of affairs, and commends to him "the most glorious spathar Euthymius," who, as the emperor's envoy, was the first to tell the Pope what he had so long wished to hear concerning Ignatius.

The letter of the patriarch Ignatius to the Pope.

Owing to the slow means of communication of those times, these two letters of Hadrian, and the embassy of Basil with his letter (just quoted), and one from Ignatius

tenuerunt) ad proprium thronum revocaretur." *Ib.* The Greeks made no difficulty in acknowledging that Ignatius had been restored and Photius expelled by virtue of authority obtained from Rome, long after the schism of Photius, even right up to the final rupture of unity by Michael Cerularius. Thus, Leo Grammaticus, who finished his *Chronog. Recent. Imperat.* in 1013, writes in his *life* of Basil: "Romam misit (Basilius) et Romanis episcopis deferentibus, scriptam in eum (Photium) sententiam obtinuit, eumdemque throno deturbavit, et Ignatium sanct. patriarcham secundo instituit." Ap. *P. G.*, Lat. ed., t. 56, p. 854.

[1] Ep. Had., Labbe, *ib.*, 1084 f.

(also addressed to Pope *Nicholas*), crossed. This letter of St. Ignatius is important, as it is as explicit an acknowledgment of the position of the Pope in the Church on the part of the Church of Constantinople, as that of Basil was on the State's behalf. The saint begins by saying that there are many physicians of the ailments of the body; but for the cure of His own members, Our Saviour has appointed "only one excellent and most Catholic physician . . . . your holiness." It was for that that He addressed St. Peter with the words: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,"[1] etc. (S. Matt. xvi. 18). These blessed words He did not address to St. Peter simply, but through him to all those chief pastors who were to come after him and were to resemble him (*secundum ipsum*)—"the most divine and sacred bishops of Old Rome."[2] Ofttimes have your predecessors shown themselves vigorous in rooting out heresies and putting an end to other evils. "And in these our days your blessedness has worthily used the power given you by Christ." With the armour of truth, which prevails over everything, you have expelled the man (Photius) who forced his way into the sheepfold like a thief, robbed another of his rights, and even went so far as to forge

[1] "Eorum (vulnerum) vero quæ in membris sunt Christi . . . . unum et singularem præcellentem atque catholicissimum medicum ipse princeps summus . . . . produxit, videlicet tuam fraternam sanctitatem, et paternam almitatem: propter quæ dixit Petro magno et summo app. 'Tu es Petrus,'" etc. Ep. Ignat., *ib.*, 1009. It cannot be noted too often that if the popes themselves make any claim of power, or if any position of authority is assigned to them by others, it is not on the ground that their See is *Rome*, nor on any such mundane reason, but always on account of the words of Our Lord to St. Peter.

[2] "Tales enim beatas voces non secundum quamdam utique sortem apostolorum principi solum circumscripsit et definivit, sed per eum ad omnes qui post illum secundum ipsum efficiendi erant summi pastores, et divinissimi sacrique pontifices senioris Romæ, transmisit." *Ib.*

(*fingeret*) the acts of a council against you.[1] The falsely-called Photius (Light) you have cut off from the body of the Church, me you have restored, and to the Church here you have brought tranquillity. Obeying you cheerfully, like a son, the emperor has meted out what is just to Photius and to myself. After assuring the Pope of his affection for him, and telling him how much he thanks him for what he has done for him, Ignatius goes on to ask what has to be done with those who have been ordained by the intruder Photius, and with those who, ordained by Ignatius himself, have yet gone over to the side of Photius, either from fear or choice. In conclusion, he begs the Pope to send legates, with whose aid he may settle the affairs of Constantinople.

Imperial envoys reach Rome, 868–9.

With these letters of Basil and Ignatius the imperial envoys at last reached Rome; at least some of them did. For Peter of Sardis, the representative of Photius, though he had chosen a new ship for his voyage was shipwrecked; "and he who[2] had torn the bark of Christ, *i.e.* the Church, perished by the rending of his own ship." Doubtless the same storm which shipwrecked the envoy of Photius delayed the other ambassadors of Basil.

Synod in Rome, 868–9.

When they reached Rome they presented (at the end of 868, or the beginning of 869) their letters and presents to the Pope, who received them with his bishops and nobles in the sacristy of St. Mary Major. After the singing of the *laudes*, and after the envoys had returned thanks to the

[1] "In tantum jactanter elatus est, ut conventum sine subsistentia et sine persona fingeret contra irreprehensible . . . . pontificium tuum, quemadmodum fabula hippocentauros; . . . . quod etiam latenter ad principem misit." *Ib.*

[2] Anast., *in præfat. Conc. VIII.*, and *vit. Had.*, n. xxiv. The latter source states that the only survivor of the 'crafty' party of Photius was an insignificant monk (*monachulus*), who returned home anathematised because he would not in any way fulfil the mission on which he had been sent.

Roman Church, "by the exertions of which the Church of Constantinople had been freed from schism," they asked the Pope to make known to everyone the forgery of Photius, which had converted the 'latrocinale' (assembly of robbers) of 867 into a regular synod. Basil and Ignatius, "restored by your good offices," had thrust the forged document from the city, like the plague, and had sent it to the supreme head. The document was then introduced by John, the metropolitan of Silæum in Pamphylia, who dashed it to the ground, exclaiming, "Condemned at Constantinople, may it be condemned again at Rome. The devil's agent, the new Simon (Magus), the inventor of lies, even Photius put it together; the minister of Christ, the new Peter, the lover of truth, even Nicholas broke it to pieces." Stamping upon it, and striking it with his sword, the other envoy, an imperial spathar, declared that the signature of Basil which appeared in it was a forgery, as he was prepared to maintain on oath, and that the signature of Michael was obtained when he was drunk (*ebriosissimum*). Not only, he continued, was the signature of Basil a forgery, but, with the aid of his few accomplices, Photius forged the signatures of numerous bishops,[1] "that by the fraud of those who were present the simplicity of the absent might be played upon." Before a formal decision was passed upon the production in synod, Hadrian gave orders to have it carefully examined by such "as were skilled in both languages," who were to present a report theron to a council.

[1] The whole paragraph slightly abridged from the *L. P.*, n. xxv. f. "Qui (Photius) mutato caractere potuit multorum absentium episcoporum nomina cum paucis complicibus suis describere." — The signatures, he said, of the patriarchal Sees, etc., were simply those of some exiles from their respective cities, whom Photius had bribed (*muneribus excæcatos*). Pens of different kinds and other similar expedients had given the requisite appearance of dissimilarity to the list of signatures.

In due course Hadrian[1] summoned the synod. The imperial envoys were heard, the letters of Nicholas bearing on the subject read, Photius, his false council and his accomplices condemned for the third time, and the forged document committed to the flames. To the intense amazement of all, concludes the papal biographer, before anyone could imagine that it was half burnt, exhaling a vile smell, it was entirely consumed,—a shower of rain which occurred at the time only serving to augment the flames. Moreover, all the faithful, whether of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem or elsewhere, were required, under pain of anathema, to give up or burn any copies of the forgery which they might possess.[2]

Synod at St. Peter's (June 869).

On the termination of the synod, Hadrian despatched legates to Constantinople. To Donatus, bishop of Ostia, and the deacon Marinus, who had been selected by Nicholas to go to the imperial city, Hadrian added Stephen, bishop of Nepi. They were furnished not only with the letters which Nicholas had prepared for them, but with two from Hadrian himself, and with certain instructions. They were to pacify the Church of Constantinople, and restore to their churches the bishops who had been consecrated by Methodius or Ignatius, and who had sided with Photius, on condition of their signing the 'deed of reparation' (*libellus satisfactionis*) which Nicholas had already drawn up for the embassy of 866, and which had been preserved in the archives of the Roman Church.

Papal legates sent to Constantinople.

[1] "Omni senatorio popularique conventu annitente." *Ib.* In the seventh session of the eighth General Council various allocutions of Pope Hadrian to this synod, etc., are preserved. In his second allocution (Labbe, *Conc.*, viii. 1090) he declared—"Codex iste . . . . Photio fictus, ... hunc . . . . contemplantibus cunctis, et præcipue Græcorum legatis, igni traditum, in cineres quoque conjicio redigendum." *Cf. Anast. in Præfat. Conc. VIII.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 15.

[2] *Cf.* c. 5 of Hadrian's allocution on the *conciliabulum* of Photius read during the seventh session.

With regard to those who had been consecrated by Photius but were repentant, pending a final decision of the Holy See, the decision of Pope Nicholas was to remain good, and they were not to be recognised as bishops.[1]

Letter of Hadrian to the emperor.

Of the letters which Hadrian entrusted to his envoys, one was addressed to "his most desirable son," Basil. Hadrian therein informs the emperor that he has received the ambassadors sent to his predecessor Nicholas; thanks God for what has passed at Constantinople; praises Basil for turning to the Apostolic See, "which is ever wont to help Catholics," and for the cure of the troubles of the Church of Constantinople; assures him that, in the treatment he has meted out to Ignatius and Photius, he has only done "what the Apostolic See, with the whole episcopate of the West, had long ago decreed was to be done"; expresses a wish[2] that through the exertions of the emperor a numerous council might be called, over which his legates would preside and would decide on the guilt of the culprits, according to the instructions they had received; and commands all copies of the false council of Photius against the Holy See to be burnt. Finally he exhorts Basil to see to it that the decisions of the synod just held at Rome be confirmed by the signatures of the council, and carefully preserved in the archives of all the churches.

[1] *L. P.*, n. xxxiv. Of the 'libellus satisfactionis' more will be heard in connection with the Eighth General Council. Hadrian's letter to Ignatius of June 10, 869, shows the full meaning of this notice of the *L. P.* with regard to the 'Photiani.'

[2] "Volumus, per vestræ pietatis industriam, illic numerosum celebrari concilium, cui nostri quoque missi præsidentes, et culparum personarumque liquido differentias cognoscentes, juxta quod in mandatis acceperunt, singulorum libere discretiones exerceant." Ep. Had., ap. Labbe, viii. p. 982. This letter of June 10, 689, was read in the first session of the Eighth Council. *Cf. Anast. in Præfat.*, "Jussisti (Hadrianus) fieri Constantinopoli synodum"; and at the beginning of this preface he addresses Hadrian "cujus tempore atque *auctoritate* sancta universalis et magna synodus octava celebraretur."

In his letter[1] to St. Ignatius the Pope expressed his delight at his restoration, and assured the patriarch that he was determined to stand by the decisions of his predecessor, and hence that Photius and all, without exception, whom he had ordained were to be deposed. Letter to Ignatius.

After a "tortuous and toilsome" journey,[2] the papal legates at length reached Thessalonica, where they were met by a *spatharius candidatus* (an imperial life-guardsman), whom the emperor had sent to greet them and escort them on their journey. At the old town of Selymbria, on the Propontis, they found awaiting them a *protospatharius* (a captain of the guards), and Theognistus, the great supporter of Ignatius at Rome, whom the *Liber Pontificalis* dignifies with the title of *patriarchalis egumenus*, or abbot-general, as it were. Forty horses from the imperial stables, silver plate, and a crowd of servants were also there ready for their convenience. On Saturday, September 24, they had reached Castrum Rotundum, near San Stefano, where some hundreds of years before legates of Pope Hormisdas, who had come on a similar errand, had been received. The following day was fixed for their triumphal entry into Constantinople. Mounted on horses with trappings of gold, they were met by all the gorgeous groups of officials that formed the magnificent household with which the emperors of Constantinople strove to impress both the barbarians and their own peoples with a sense of their exalted power and dignity. There were imperial chamberlains, civil functionaries, grooms of the imperial stables, various corps of the guards in their long white tunics, with their golden shields and helmets, and with their gold-inlaid lances and swords, and lastly, the different Reception of the papal legates.

[1] Ap. Labbe, *ib.*, p. 1011. The letter is dated June 10, 869.

[2] "Multorum anfractuum laboriosos circuitus penetrantes." *L. P.*, n. xxxv.

grades of the clergy. At the Golden Gate, in the south-west corner of the city walls, they were met and greeted by deputies of the patriarch, his librarian and others, in their ecclesiastical vestments, and by the people, all bearing torches. Thus, for some three miles, were they solemnly escorted to the palace of the Magnaura, which communicated by covered arcades with Saint Sophia.

The Eighth General Council, 869.

Most flattering was the reception[1] given to them by the emperor (September 27). He received them with the greatest kindness, kissed the letters of the Pope, and assured the envoys that "the Roman Church, the holy mother of all the Churches of God," had looked after the interests of the Church of Constaninople, torn in pieces by the ambition of Photius, and that by the authority[2] of the letters of Pope Nicholas, Ignatius had been restored to his See. For two years, he continued, have we and all the Oriental patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops been awaiting the decision of our holy mother the Roman Church; and we now trust that at length by the authority of your holy college (*i.e.* the council) the scandals caused by Photius may be terminated, and that the long-wished-for unity may be at last restored in accordance with the decrees of Pope Nicholas. The papal legates made answer that it was for those purposes that they had come. But, they continued, we cannot admit any Oriental into our synod before he has signed the 'libellus satisfactionis' which we have brought from Rome. Upon this the emperor and the patriarch at once asked what was the purport of the document, as the demand was a new one. At once translated into Greek, the 'libellus' was forthwith signed by some, and at first rejected by others. However, these

[1] *L. P.*, § 35 f.

[2] "Quarum (litteræ Nicolai) auctoritate presens pater noster Ignatius .... sedi propriæ restitutus est." *Ib.*, § 39.

latter afterwards changed their minds, and were admitted equally with the former to the council.[1]

The Eighth General Council was solemnly opened October 5, 869. Apart from the lay representatives of the emperor, the council was at first composed of the following only: the three legates of the Pope, the patriarch St. Ignatius, Thomas, archbishop of Tyre, who came to respond for the See of Antioch, which was at that time vacant, the priest Elias, who came to represent Theodosius, patriarch of Jerusalem, and the twelve bishops who had throughout remained faithful to Ignatius. Opening of the synod, Oct. 869.

Prefixed to the acts[2] of the Council there is an 'introduction,' which was drawn up by the Greeks at the close of the synod; and as it sums up its work, it may be usefully cited here. It notes that the S. Scriptures had prepared us for false prophets, for wolves in sheep's clothing, for trees which bring not forth good fruit. Such was Photius. But Pope Nicholas, the new Elias, had slain the wolf and cut down the barren tree. With his good work had the emperor Basil co-operated.

At the beginning of the first session of the council, the First session of the Council.

[1] Direct from the *L. P.*, n. xl. The Greek *Liber Synodicus* calls this council "the divine sacred ecumenical eighth synod: *Θείαν καὶ ἱερὰν οἰκουμενικὴν ὀγδόην Συνόδον.*" *Cf.* Leo Allatius, *De octava synodo*, Rome, 1662.

[2] The original acts of this council were lost when the papal legates on their return from Constantinople fell into the hands of Slavonic pirates. Our knowledge of its doings is derived from a careful translation of a *copy* of the original Greek *acts*. Both the copy and the version were made by Anastasius, the librarian, who reached the imperial city before the close of the council. He had been sent by the Emperor Louis II. to negotiate the betrothal of his daughter to the infant son (Constantine) of Basil, and by the Pope for the express purpose of making a translation of the Acts. This translation of Anastasius, with his notes, is still extant, and is to be found among his works, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, or in the *Councils*, Labbe, viii. 961 f.; Mansi, xvi., etc. Anastasius, in his preface to his translation, tells us of the great care with which he made the translation. There is also extant a Greek abridgment of the 'Acts.'

papal legates were rather startled by being asked to read the papers showing their powers; but complied when it was pointed out to them that the request was made not out of any want of respect[1] for the Holy See, but because the previous legates, Radoald and Zachary, had not acted in accordance with their instructions. After the credentials of the envoys of all the patriarchs had been found satisfactory, the 'libellus satisfactionis' was then read in both Latin and Greek. This document, substantially the same as that of Pope Hormisdas (519), opened by proclaiming that it was of the first importance to guard the rule of the true faith. And "in the Apostolic See[2] the Catholic religion has ever been preserved immaculate." Desiring, continues the document, never to be separated from this faith, and following in everything the decisions (*constituta*) of the Fathers, and especially of the prelates of the Apostolic See, we anathematise all heresies, the iconoclasts, and Photius, as long as he shall remain disobedient to the decrees of the Roman pontiffs, and refuse to anathematise the acts of the so-called council (*conciliabulum*), which he had gathered together, outraging the Apostolic See. We follow the synod held by Pope Nicholas, and subscribed by you, O supreme Pontiff Hadrian, and the one which you yourself have lately held. And we will hold to all that has been therein decreed, and condemn all those who have been there condemned—viz., Photius, his partisans, and the robber-synods which he held against Ignatius and against "the principate of the Apostolic See."

[1] "Nos propter inhonorantiam apostolici throni non dicimus hoc, sed quia anteriores vestri accedentes missi, Radoaldus scilicet et Zacharias, deceperunt nos, alia in mandatis habentes, et alia facientes." *P. L.*, *ib.*, 31.

[2] "In sede apostololica immaculata est semper catholica reservata religio et sancta celebrata doctrina." The *libellus* is printed in full in the acts of the first session of the council, *e.g.* ap. *P. L.*, *ib.*, p. 36.

With regard to Ignatius and those of his party, "we follow devoutly what the authority of your Apostolic See has decided." The *Libellus* was at once accepted by the whole synod.[1] After a declaration on the part of the representatives of the Oriental patriarchs, that all—as they did themselves—ought to obey the decrees of Pope Nicholas, the session closed with the customary acclamations in honour of the emperor, popes Nicholas and Hadrian, the patriarchs of the East, and the synod.

The other sessions of the Council.

After this detailed account of the first session of the council, the work of the other sessions must be given in brief, as to narrate at large the history of the council belongs rather to the historian of the history of the Church than to the biographer of the popes. In the second session the bishops who had been consecrated by Ignatius and his predecessor Methodius, but who had had the misfortune afterwards to take sides with Photius, were allowed by the legates to take their seats in the council, on the conditions of repentance and signing the 'libellus.' Hence in the third session there were present, over and above the Roman legates, Ignatius and the vicars of the Oriental

[1] "Tota sancta synodus exclamavit: Juste et convenienter lectus nobis libellus expositus est a S. Rom. Ecclesia, et propterea omnibus placet." *Ib.*, p. 39. In one of his notes Anastasius here informs us that, after the *libellus* had been signed, and the various copies, with the signatures of the bishops attached, had been handed over to the papal legates, some of those who had signed insinuated to the emperor and to Ignatius that a great mistake had been made in thus submitting the Church of Constantinople to that of Rome. Influenced by this representation, Basil contrived to get a considerable number of the signed documents stolen from the legates. When, however, on discovering the loss, the papal envoys boldly urged the emperor to insist on an open and public recantation if it was thought that the *libellus* ought not to have been signed, Basil had the documents restored, saying that he had approached the Apostolic See "as the mistress of ecclesiastical affairs" (*ut magistram eccles. negotiorum*), and so he would obey not his own feelings but their judgment. *P. L.*, *ib.*, p. 39. *Cf. L. P.*, n. 45 f.

patriarchs, twenty-three bishops; and the number gradually increased as time went on. As Photius would not listen to any exhortations to confess his misdeeds, but affected the silence of innocence,[1] he was solemnly anathematised (seventh session, October 29). In the eighth session (November 5) there were burnt before his eyes the false acts of the synods which he had held against Ignatius and Pope Nicholas,[2] and other documents to which he had illegally obtained signatures. Iconoclasm was also condemned in this session. By the ninth session (February 12, 870) sixty-six bishops had assembled, and the representatives of the patriarchal Sees received an addition to their number in the person of the monk Joseph, archdeacon of Michael, or Chail I., patriarch of Alexandria.[3] Joseph expressed in writing his adhesion to what had been decided by the "vicars of Old Rome and of the Oriental Sees." The tenth and last session (February 28, 870) saw present the ambassadors of the Emperor Louis II., among whom was the versatile Anastasius, some twelve envoys from the king of the Bulgarians, and 102 bishops. The comparatively small number of bishops who attended this synod is due to the fact that a very large number of sees had been filled up by Photius with his creatures, and that, as most of them adhered to him and to his schism, they

[1] "Ad extremam taciturnitatis inertiam devolutus." *L. P.*, n. xli. *Cf.* the *acts* of the fifth session. To the customary acclamations at the close of this session, a set of verses are appended in the Acts. They denounce:

"Photius, who erst th' unconquered rock
Would feign with fraud and folly break,
Is now, like savage beast, expelled
His See's unspotted couch and church.

. . . . . .

Nicholas, Hadrian, full wise
Were judges with Ignatius blest
With triple chiefs of Eastern faith."

[2] *L. P.*, *ib.* [3] *Cf.* Neale's *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, ii. 162 f.

were not allowed to take part in the deliberations of the council.

The twenty-seven canons, which were published in this session, were inserted in a condensed form in the 'definition'[1] (ὅρος, terminus) put forth as usual by the council. Particular mention need here only be made of the twenty-first, as it directly concerns the Popes. It forbids any display of want of respect towards any of the five patriarchs, "especially (præcipue) towards the most holy Pope of Holy Rome," against whom no one may presume to speak or write. Should any difficulty arise regarding the Roman Church, modest enquiries may be made about it, but not even a universal synod "may audaciously pass decrees against the supreme pontiffs of Old Rome."

After reaffirming the decrees of the previous seven general councils, the 'definition' proclaimed that Photius, "a[2] man who trusted in his varied cunning," had come to such a pitch of arrogance as to vent his spleen on the most blessed Pope Nicholas. In his pretended synod "he dared to anathematise the Pope and all who communicated with him," *i.e.* as the definition adds, all the bishops and priests throughout the world, for all were in communion with Pope Nicholas. And so "this holy and universal synod" now condemns Photius as popes Nicholas and Hadrian have already done.

As soon as the *Acts* of the council had been drawn up and placed in the hands of the legates, "to guard against Greek fraud,"[3] they placed them for careful examination

[1] Ap. *P. L.*, *ib.*, p. 162 f.

[2] "Miser Photius . . . . speravit in multitudine versutiarum suarum. . . . . In supremam quippe arrogantiam elatus est contra b. P. Nicolaum, malitiæ suæ venenum evomuit."

[3] "Ne quid Græca levitas falsum suatim congesserit." *L. P.*, n. xlii. *Cf.* what Anastasius says of himself and of his work regarding the text of this synod, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 17, in his oft-mentioned preface.

in the custody of Anastasius, the librarian, who had come to Constantinople on behalf of Louis II., to negotiate a marriage between his daughter and the son of Basil. He was present at the last session of the council, and was officially described as an "apocrisiarius of Louis, emperor of the Italians and Franks," not, be it noticed, "emperor of the *Romans*." Anastasius soon discovered that the additions "in praise of *our* most serene emperor," which Hadrian, on the instigation of Arsenius, had added to the letter of Nicholas, had been erased. In great indignation the papal legates declared they would not subscribe the acts unless the Pope's letter were inserted in its entirety. But the Greeks simply declared that they had not met together to deliberate about imperial titles, but about the things of God. The legates, therefore, resolved to sign the synodal decrees only conditionally.[1]

The signing of the 'Acts.'

Five copies of the Acts (one for each of the patriarchs) were prepared for signature. The papal legates signed first, and each of them used the same restrictive formula as Donatus, whose signature headed the list, and ran as follows: "I, Donatus, by the grace of God, bishop of the Holy Church of Ostia, holding the place of my lord Hadrian, supreme Pontiff and universal Pope, presiding over this holy and universal synod, have promulgated all that is read above, and have with my own hand put my signature to it, till the will of the aforesaid pre-eminent prelate (be made known)." The signatures of the Emperor Basil and his two sons followed those of the patriarchs, and then came the signatures of the 102 bishops.

The sensational story of Nicetas.

Nicetas,[2] indeed, asserts, on the authority of having heard

[1] "Ad hoc usque perventum est ut interposita conditione voluntatis apostolicæ diffinitis sententiis minus diffinite subscriberent." *L. P.*, n. xliii.

[2] *In vit. Ig.*, ap. Labbe, viii. 1231. *Cf.* Append. III., vol. i., pt. i., of this work.

it 'from those who knew,' what he might well call 'a most awful thing,' viz., that the bishops, when signing this decree, dipped their pens not into ink but into the Sacred Blood of Our Saviour, contained in the consecrated chalice. But of this there is not a word in the Acts of the Council; nor has Anastasius, who has left us notes in connection with this synod on much less striking points, a word to say about so extraordinary a proceeding. And as the Acts specially mention that the emperors' signatures were countersigned by Christopher, the first of the secretaries and "keeper of the purple ink,"[1] it is hard to believe that, had the bishops not signed with ink, such a circumstance would not have been mentioned. Besides, we do not know who those were 'that knew' and told Nicetas—not one of the bishops, or he would have said so. There seems, therefore, no need to attach any credence to the story.

Letters of the Council.

In addition to an encyclical letter to all the faithful recounting what it had done, the synod addressed a letter to Hadrian,[2] asking him to confirm the decisions of the council, which were practically his own, and to publish them. Letters[3] to him followed, somewhat later, from the emperor and Ignatius also. Both of them write to ask the Pope to allow of certain exceptions to be made in the matter of the decision not to allow *any* of those who had

[1] The ink used by the emperors in writing charters.

[2] Ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 190. The letter calls Nicholas and Hadrian "veri pastores rationabilium ovium Christi, quinimo summi pastores et principes omnium ecclesiarum. . . . Prædica eam (synodum) magis, ac veluti propriam, et sollicitius confirma coangelicis præceptionibus et admonitionibus vestris, ut per sapientissimum magisterium vestrum etiam aliis universis ecclesiis personet."

[3] *Ib.*, p. 191 f. The letter of Ignatius adds one more testimony to the innumerable others furnished by the Acts of this Council, to the fact that the Greeks acknowledged the primacy of the See of Peter. He speaks of our Lord as making Rome, through SS. Peter and Paul, "eximiam principalem app. summitatem," and as making it even more famous 'in our time' through Nicholas and Hadrian.

been ordained by Photius to exercise their functions. And the emperor expresses astonishment that he has not heard of the safe return of the papal legates.

In a letter,[1] dated November 10, 871, the Pope, in reply to the emperor, thanks God that he has shown such care for religion, and for seeking, in accordance with ancient law, the decisions of the Holy See on disputed questions. But he lets Basil see how indignant he is that his legates were so far neglected after the council that (as has been narrated above[2]) they fell into the hands of pirates and were completely robbed; and that he has given his countenance to Ignatius's consecration of a bishop in Bulgaria—of which more hereafter. He begs Basil to hinder Ignatius from interfering in that country, or else the patriarch and others who may there exercise any ecclesiastical functions will find themselves excommunicated. In fine, he cannot see his way to altering the decision come to against those who have been ordained by Photius.[3]

The Bulgarian Question.

Before the papal legates started on their disastrous homeward journey they were inveigled into a discussion on the patriarchal rights over Bulgaria. It has been already[4] stated that Pope Nicholas refused the request of King Boris that he might be allowed to have Formosus of Porto as his archbishop, and even terminated the latter's mission to the Bulgarians by ordering him to proceed to Constantinople.[5] But he so far complied with the king's wishes that he had commissioned a fresh band of missionaries to set out for Bulgaria when his death interfered with their departure. One of the first acts, however, of Hadrian was

[1] Ap. Labbe, viii. 1173 f. [2] *Cf. L. P., in vit.*, § 59 f.

[3] On the whole of this synod, *cf.* Hefele, v. 494 f. (French ed.). On the theory of the *penturchia* of the five patriarchates in the Church, which was more than insinuated by certain of the Greeks in this Council, *cf.* Jungmann, *Diss.*, xvii. § 90 f.

[4] *Supra*, p. 118. [5] *L. P., in vit. Nic.*, §§ 74, 75.

to despatch the missionaries (867), furnishing them with the letters which had been drawn up by Pope Nicholas, but which he now sent in his own name, to show that, "as far as the stormy state of the times would permit," he intended to walk in the footsteps of his predecessor.[1]

Whether he went to Constantinople or not, Formosus remained some time longer in Bulgaria. But he returned to Rome apparently in the very beginning of the year 868, and was present at the council held there in June 869. Finding that he could not get his favourite Formosus made archbishop of Bulgaria, Boris sent him to Rome to ask that the deacon Marinus might be given that post. Marinus had taken the wild monarch's fancy when, in 866, sent by Nicholas, he passed through Bulgaria to try to reach Constantinople by that route. The legates of Boris were further instructed to the effect that, if they could not obtain the consecration of Marinus as their new archbishop, they were to ask that one of the cardinal-priests of the Roman Church might be sent out for their approval.[2] A request for a man who "in character, learning, and appearance was most worthy of the archiepiscopate," shows at once the wisdom of Boris himself, and his estimate of Formosus, who was evidently his ideal of a bishop. As Marinus had already been selected to represent the Pope at the General Council, and was, moreover, unwilling to go, Hadrian "sent a certain subdeacon Silvester" for the approval of the Bulgarians. He was, however, promptly sent back by Boris, who most earnestly requested that an archbishop, or Formosus of Porto, might be granted him. This importunity on behalf of Formosus has been attributed

[1] *L. P.*, *in vit. Had.*, § 12.

[2] "Quem (aliquem ex cardinalibus) post approbationem eorundem (Bulgarum) denuo remeantem archiepiscopali ministerio sublimaret (Hadrianus)." *L. P.*, n. 61.

both by his contemporaries and by moderns to his own intrigues. Hence, when he was condemned by John VIII. in 876, it was declared that he had so played upon the new convert that, under oath, he had engaged Boris not to accept any other archbishop than himself, and had in turn agreed to come back as soon as he could.[1] Other authors, however, are inclined to believe that Boris acted as he did from genuine admiration for the character of Formosus, that he was anxious for a hierarchy that would rival that of Constantinople, and that he thought that Formosus would be no mean match even for the learned Photius. At any rate, when he found that his request had not been granted—for Hadrian, who evidently did not care to have another man of his choice rejected, had only written back to say that he would consecrate any one (other than Formosus) whom Boris might choose to select—he became utterly impatient, and turned to Constantinople.[2]

The envoys of Boris at the Eighth General Council.

His envoys reached the imperial city (February 870) in time, as we have seen, to take part in the last session of the council. Whether Basil's procuring the aid of the Pope to put an end to the religious strife of his empire was a mere political move or not, his action with regard to Bulgaria was certainly dictated by motives of worldly policy. Bulgaria, spiritually dependent upon his patriarch, would be a step nearer to being altogether submissive to his power. He determined, therefore, to bring about its ecclesiastical subjection to Constantinople. Accordingly, three days

[1] Ep. Joan. VIII., Ep. 24, ap. *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 675. "Regis animos adeo suis calliditatibus vitiavit, ut terribilibus sacramentis eum sibi obstrinxisse testatus sit, ne se vivo quemlibet episcopum a sede apostolica suscipisset," etc.

[2] *L. P.*, §§ 62, 63. A modern author in *The Balkans*, pt. ii., Bulgaria, (Story of the Nations Series), p. 134, attributes the turning of Boris to Constantinople "to the accession of the emperor Basil I. who had been as a boy a Bulgarian prisoner."

after the completion of the council and the signing of the acts, with artful intent (*callide*), he called a meeting in his palace of the papal legates, St. Ignatius, the representatives of the three other patriarchs, the envoys of Boris, and a few others to receive the letters of the Bulgarian monarch. The envoys of the king opened the proceedings by saying that their master, hearing that "by the apostolic authority" an assembly to deliberate on the needs of the Church had been gathered together from all parts, had sent them to enquire from it to what Church the Bulgarians ought to be subject. They were at once told by the papal legates that they belonged to the Holy Roman Church, and that their king had dedicated himself and his people to Blessed Peter, the prince of the Apostles, from whose successor, Nicholas, he had received not only instructions as to how his people were to live, but also bishops and priests. That they were still under the jurisdiction of the Roman Church, they showed by the fact that they had yet in honour among them the ecclesiastics who had been thus sent. The Bulgarians, however, while acknowledging all this, called for a formal definition of their ecclesiastical position. But the legates declared that all the matters with which they had been commissioned to deal had been settled in the council; but that, as far as they were concerned, they would not agree to Bulgaria's being subject to any patriarchal jurisdiction other than that of Rome, seeing that the whole cpuntry was full of Latin priests. Here the Orientals interjected that, when the Bulgarians took possession of their present country they found Greek priests there, and argued that hence its present occcupants ought to be under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. Against this the papal legates keenly urged that it was undoubted that at first both the old and new Epirus, Thessaly, and Dardania, including the present capital of

the Bulgarian kingdom[1] (Achrida, the ancient Lychnidos), were included in the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome as patriarch of the West. They further contended that the Bulgarians had of their own accord voluntarily submitted to the jurisdiction of Rome, and that finally the missionaries from Rome had, in fact, converted the nation and ruled it for three years. Besides, continued the legates, the Holy Apostolic See judges, but is not judged; to that See, which is as easily able to annul any decision you may come to, as you are inconsiderately to form one, to it we reserve all decision on this matter.[2] Thereupon the vicars of the Oriental patriarchs declared that it was anything but right that the Romans, who were separated from the Greek empire, and had allied themselves with the Franks, should be able to hold ordinations within the Greek dominions, and that they decided that Bulgaria must pass under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. But the papal

[1] At least it is most likely that such is the meaning of the phrase, "Dardania civitas," of the *L. P.* . . . "atque Dardaniam, in qua et Dardania civitas hodie demonstratur." Achrida was situated in 'New Epirus.' Though part of the then kingdom of Bulgaria (viz., its eastern portion) had never been under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of the West, the legates argued that 'Bulgaria' had of old been subject to the Pope, as patriarch of the West, because its western portion, and *particularly* its capital city, used to be, before the violent action of the iconoclast Leo, 'the Isaurian,' had deprived him of it. With the above passage of the *L. P.* on the ancient jurisdiction of the patriarch of the West in those parts, compare the following from Anastasius (*Præfat. in Synod. Oct.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 19): "Nam tota Dardania, Thessalia, Dacia et utraque Epirus, atque ceteræ regiones juxta Istrum fluvium sitæ apostolicæ sedis vestræ moderamine antiquitus præcipue regebantur et disponebantur. . . . Sed imperatores Romanorum, qui nunc Græcorum appellantur . . . . privilegia Sedis Ap. corrumpunt, et pene omnia jura disponendarum diœceseon auferunt," etc. Perhaps *Dardania civitas* refers to the ancient capital of Dardania, Scupi (Uskub), afterwards Justiniana Prima. *Cf. supra*, p. 118 ff.

[2] "S. sedes apost. vos, quia revera inferiores estis, super sua causa iudices nec elegit, nec per nos elegit, utpote quæ de omni ecclesia sola specialiter fas habeat judicandi," etc. *L. P.*, n. 55.

legates at once proclaimed their sentence of no value, and solemnly adjured Ignatius, by God, His angels, and all those present, not to presume to ordain anyone for Bulgaria, or to send any of his subjects thither. This prohibition, they said, they made in accordance with a letter of Pope Hadrian which they handed him. Though much pressed to do so, Ignatius would not open the letter, but vaguely declared that he would never be so presumptuous as to act against the honour of the Holy See.[1]

To this account of the conference on the 'Bulgarian question,' furnished by the *Book of the Popes*, a few important additions must be made from the introduction to his translation of the Acts of the Eighth General Council by Anastasius. He was at Constantinople at the time when the conference was held. The librarian assures us, in the first place, that it is by no means[2] certain that the vicars of the Oriental patriarchs ever really did decide in favour of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria passing to Constantinople. For, to begin with, the conference was a 'packed'[3] one, from which Anastasius himself, whose thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin would have been of great assistance to the papal legates, was carefully excluded. Only one interpreter was admitted to the meeting, and he was merely allowed to exercise his office in accordance with instructions received from the emperor. That is, the words of the papal legates and the Orientals were so arranged as to deceive the Bulgarian envoys, who were given a document in which it was set

[1] "Absit a me ut ego his presumptionibus contra decorem sedis apostolicæ implicer." *Ib.*, n. 58.

[2] "Hoc ipsum (viz., Bulgarorum diœcesim urbi fore subjiciendam) an loci servatores Orientis decreverint, *nullis certis probetur indiciis*." *Præfat.*, *l. c.*, p. 20.

[3] "Nulli deforis venienti patebat aditus, nisi cui vel imperator vel patriarcha forsitan permisisset." *Ib.*, p. 21.

out that the Oriental vicars had decided between Rome and Constantinople in favour of the latter.[1]

Greek ecclesiastics again in Bulgaria.

The sequel to this disreputable affair was that Greek clergy were again introduced into Bulgaria. One, Theophylactus,[2] was consecrated its archbishop by Ignatius, and the Latin clergy, according to the report of Bishop Grimwald, were expelled. The papal biographer, however, assures us, on the authority of the banished clergy, that they were not so much driven out by the Greeks or Bulgarians as betrayed for gold by their bishop himself (Grimwald).

It was to no purpose that Hadrian wrote (November 10, 871) both to the emperor[3] and to Ignatius to protest against the conduct of the latter. Although, as we shall see, successors of Hadrian endeavoured to bring back the Bulgarians to their allegiance to Rome, it was all in vain. After considerable coquetting with both Rome and Constantinople, they, most unfortunately for themselves, threw in their lot with the decaying East; and, until comparatively quite recently, shared in the 'decline and fall' of Constantinople. On December 30, 1860, a section of the Bulgarians united themselves with the See of Rome.[4] But when, a few years ago (1896), a little display of

[1] Still the *preface*. Both Anastasius (p. 20) and the Pope's biographer (*L. P.*, n. 63) speak of bribes being freely used by the Greeks to draw off the Bulgarians from their allegiance to the See of Rome.

[2] It seems to have been to this bishop that Petrus Siculus dedicated his *Historia Manichæorum seu Paulicianorum* who were to spread their heresy in Bulgaria, and thence into the rest of Europe.

[3] For the letter to the emperor, see above, p. 208. Only a fragment of the letter to Ignatius (ap. Mansi, xvi.) is extant.

[4] Hergenröther, *Hist. Eccles.*, viii. 26 f. The influence acquired by Russia in the Balkans, after the Russo-Turkish War (1877–8), was fatal to the movement in favour of reunion with Rome. In 1872 the dismemberment of the patriarchate of Constantinople was still further advanced by the Church of the Bulgarians declaring itself independent of any ecclesiastical superior. *Cf.* d'Avril, *La Bulgarie Chrétienne*, p. 99 ff.

character on the part of the Catholic sovereign of Bulgaria (Ferdinand I.) would have paved the way to the reunion of the whole country with Rome, the opportunity was lost; and, for fear of losing his crown, estimated at more than honour and conscience, he allowed his son—another Boris—to be baptized in the Greek Church.

The papal legates are seized by pirates.

Anything but pleased with the spirited conduct of the papal legates at his secret conference, the emperor, while loading them with presents, did not trouble to take proper measures for their safe return to Rome. His officials conducted them to Dyrrachium, and there left them without furnishing them with warships for their sea voyage. At that seaport they parted company with Anastasius. With his own copy of the acts of the council, and with the *libelli satisfactionis* of the Greek bishops which had been entrusted to his charge, the librarian sailed to Siponto, and reached Rome in safety. But the legates, sailing by the more northerly route to Ancona, were attacked by a fleet of Slavonic pirates from the Dalmatian coast under Domagoï, grand *Joupan* of Croatia, stripped of all they possessed, even of the original acts of the council, made prisoners, and only at length released through the strong representations which were made both by the emperor and the Pope.[1]

SS. Cyril and Methodius

If, towards the end of his pontificate, Hadrian was saddened by the defection of one branch of the great Slavonic people, he was gladdened by the conversion of others, and by the coming to Rome in the beginning of his reign of the apostles of the Slavs, SS. Cyril and Methodius. With their glorious names Christianity in every Slavonic country, from Russia and Poland to Dalmatia and the border confines of Germany, is connected either by the

[1] *L. P.*, n. 59 f.; Anastasius, in his note to the first session of the council; and Pope Hadrian (Jaffé, 2943), in a letter to the emperor in which he reproaches him for his want of care of the legates.

authentic records of certain history or by a no mean tradition.

In their endeavours to get control over the Slavs of Moravia, the Germans, unhappily for themselves, replaced the rebel king Moimir by his nephew Rostislav, or Rastiz — to give two more different spellings of his name in use.[1] They had replaced a weak enemy by a powerful one. Rastiz freed his people from the arms of the German, and gave them Christianity. Naturally, however, he turned elsewhere than to Germany for teachers of it. SS. Cyril and Methodius were sent (*c.* 863), at his request, by Michael III. from Constantinople.[2] Two men better fitted by nature and by grace for the work to which they were called could not well have been found. The two brothers, possibly themselves of Slavonic origin, were born of a good family at Thessalonica (Salonica), a city of the Eastern Empire, then only second in importance to Constantinople itself. It was a city not only crowded with Slavs, but in contact with Slav populations who had settled all round it. Before they left their native city the two brothers had acquired that knowledge of the manners and language of the Slavs which they were hereafter to turn to such good account. Constantine (born 827), better known as Cyril, the name he took along with the monastic habit on his death-bed, received the most considerable part of his education at Constantinople; for his father, who held an important position among the local authorities at Thessalonica, could afford to give his children the best education that money could purchase.

[1] See above, p. 111.

[2] He sent in the first instance to Pope Nicholas. (*Cf.* the letter of Pope Hadrian to Rastiz, ap. Leger, pp. 113, 114). Perchance a want of suitable priests may have been the cause why Nicholas did not comply with the request of Rastiz, but, as Leger (p. 81 n.) thinks possible, referred him to Constantinople. *Cf.* Nestor, *c.* 20.

Among the famous men under whom he studied was Photius, with whom, as did every other man who came under his influence, he formed a close friendship. It was on the strength of this familiarity that the saint afterwards blamed him for his attitude towards Ignatius, whilst the latter was yet patriarch. It is, he said, because "you are quite[1] blinded by the smoke of avarice and jealousy, that the eyes of your wisdom, though naturally keen, cannot see the path of justice." Cyril's learning became so great that he received the surname of the 'Philosopher.' Although the highest offices of the State were within his reach, he preferred, after having been ordained priest, to retire from the world. It was only with difficulty that he could be prevailed upon to leave his monastery and return to Constantinople to profess philosophy.

Methodius,[2] who was some years older than his brother, had qualities and experiences which his more intellectual and retiring younger brother lacked. He was a man of action. For many years he was governor of one of the Slav colonies which were then so numerous both in the East, in the Opsikion theme (or province), and in the West, in the neighbourhood of Andrinople and Thessalonica. After a time, however, he also withdrew from the world, and betook himself to a monastery.

When the ambassadors of Rastiz reached Constantinople, in their quest of Christian teachers for their country, Cyril had already gained fame as a missionary. At the request of the emperor he had laboured among the Moslems during the caliphate of Mutawakkil (847–861); and then,

[1] "Oculi sapientiæ tuæ, quantumlibet sint magni et patuli, avaritiæ tamen et invidiæ fumo penitus obcæcati, tramitem justitiæ videre non possunt." Anast., *in Præfat. Synod. VIII.*, p. 14.

[2] This Methodius is not the monk who is said to have painted a picture of the Last Judgment for King Boris of Bulgaria, which frightened him into becoming a Christian. Lapôtre, p. 106, note.

along with his brother, with complete success among the powerful Khazars on the northern shores of the Black Sea. It was during this mission that S. Cyril obtained possession of the relics of Pope St. Clement from the Crimea. The martyr had been drowned near Cherson.

They go to the Moravians.

Although from his previous toils Cyril was, to use the words of his biographer, "exhausted, and worn with disease," and had retired to the monastery of Polychronius in Constantinople, he consented, when asked by the emperor, to go with his brother to labour for Christ among the Moravians. Before the middle of 864, the brothers had begun their new work.[1] Their amiability and gentleness, their learning and experience, their knowledge of the Slavonic tongue, and the administrative capacity of Methodius, told with wonderful effect for the spread of Christianity among a people who had hitherto only known it as the religion of the men who were trying to crush their independence, and were as much disposed to drive them into the fold of Christ at the points of their lances as to call them into it with His sweet words. Still further to attract the people to the truths of Christianity, St. Cyril, with his brother's aid, invented a *practical* Slavonic alphabet. There had already been in existence for some centuries an exceedingly clumsy alphabet, known as the Glagolitic (from *glagol*, a sound or word), and thought by some to have been invented by St. Jerome, himself a native of Dalmatia. The letters of the new alphabet, called from the name of our saint the Cyrilic, were made to follow the order of the Greek alphabet, and new characters were added to the existing Glagolitic to express the sounds peculiar

[1] According to the *Moravian legend*, they passed through Bulgaria, converting its inhabitants as they went along. "Egressus vero venit primo ad Bulgaros, quos . . . . convertit ad fidem." Ap. *Cirillo e Metodio*, p. 31 n. *Cf.* the *Bohemian* and other *legends*, *ib.*, pp. 37, 38.

to the Slavonic tongue.[1] By means of this alphabet the brothers translated portions of the Bible and of the Oriental, or, more probably, Roman, liturgical books into Slavonic.[2]

Greater Moravia.

The country in which first the two brothers together, and then Methodius by himself, especially laboured was Moravia. But it was a larger country than that of to-day; it was the Moravian empire at the height of its power under Rastiz (†870) and his nephew and successor Swatopluk. It embraced not only the land north of the Danube which now bears that name, but also Bohemia, Silesia, and most of the other provinces which make up the modern kingdom of Austria proper, along with Western Hungary as far as the Theiss. Hence it included

[1] *Cf.* Lapôtre, p. 102; *Slavonic Literature*, by Morfill, p. 18 f.; and especially chap. iv. of Neale's *Notes on Dalmatia*, and p. 822 ff. of his *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*; d'Avril, *St. Cyrille*, c. 4 ff.; Gaster, *Ilchester Lectures on Greeko-Slavonic Literature* (London, 1887), p. 209 ff.; and c. xiii. of Leger. It should be observed that there are very many other theories as to the Cyrilic and Glagolitic alphabets besides the one given in the text. John VIII., in a letter (Ep. 293) of June 880, to Swatopluk, the successor of Rastiz, speaks of "litteras Sclavonicas, a Constantino (Cyrillo) quodam philosopho repertas." A German source (*Excerptum e libel. de convers. Carent.*, ap. Migne, t. 129, p. 1272) speaks of the arrival in Carinthia of "quidam Sclavus ab Hystriæ et Dalmatiæ partibus, nomine Methodius qui adinvenit Sclavicas litteras et Scalvice celebravit divinum officium et vilescere fecit Latinum; tandem fugatus a Carentanis partibus intravit Moraviam." The two brothers, in fact, worked together at the formation of the alphabet. Leger thinks, not on such good grounds seemingly, that Cyril added to the Greek alphabet from Oriental languages, and that the Glagolitic alphabet was invented later—was founded on the Cyrilic alphabet and was fashioned by the Western Slavs to differentiate themselves from the Eastern Slavs, and thus save their native liturgy from absolute condemnation by Rome.

[2] *Cf.* c. 6 of d'Avril's *St. Cyrille*, where convincing arguments are adduced to show that it was the Roman liturgy which the saints translated. Hence Innocent X. speaks of their liturgy as being in accordance with the Roman rite, but as written in the language of the Slavs, and in characters which commonly bear the name of St. Jerome (Ep. of Feb. 22, 1648, ap. *ib.*, p. 201).

as well the old imperial South-Danubian provinces of Noricum and Pannonia which had tasted of Roman civilisation and Christianity, as heathen lands north of the Danube into which the arms of Rome had not forced an entrance, and into which the Cross of Christ had been but fitfully hitherto carried. Greater Moravia had neither a long nor a peaceful existence. Begun under Moimir I., during the reign of the emperor Louis the Pious, and after the destruction of the kingdom of the Avars by Charlemagne, this Slav empire endured till the days of Moimir II., when it was destroyed by the fiercesome Hungarians at the terrible battle of Presburg (907). During the whole period of its existence it had to struggle against a strong tendency to internal dissolution, as its chiefs were but feebly attached to the central authority, and against the Germans, who strove to subject it both politically and ecclesiastically to the empire of the Franks. Hence, while its temporal rulers had to fight for national independence with the secular princes of the Teutons, its saintly Greek missionaries had to struggle against the pretensions of the German hierarchy which claimed spiritual jurisdiction especially over the Slavs of the South-Danubian provinces. For after the Huns and Avars had blotted out their primitive (imperial) Christian organisation, the blessings of the faith had been reintroduced among them by the Franks, and a certain ecclesiastical organisation, subject to the bishops of Salzburg, Passau and Ratisbon, established by Charlemagne. Such then was the land, and such the circumstances in which the saintly brothers carried on their heroic labours.[1]

[1] The area influenced by SS. Cyril and Methodius may, to some extent, be gathered from the addresses of some of the letters of John VIII. *Cf.* Jaffé, 2964, to Domagoï, Duke of the Slavs; 2972, to Kociel, Count or Prince of Pannonia; 2973, to Muntimir, Duke of Sclavonia; 3259, to Branimir, Duke of Croatia; and 3319, to Swatopluk, Count or Prince of Pannonia.

As Cyril was not a bishop, and Methodius not even a priest, it became necessary for them to turn their attention to obtaining bishops for the Moravians, that the Church in their country might be put on a proper and independent basis. It was at this juncture that Pope Nicholas sent for them to come to Rome. That they should be summoned to Rome was necessary, not only because, in introducing a liturgy in a new tongue (the Sclavonic), they were doing something out of the ordinary, but because of the opposition, jealous indeed, but not unnatural, of the Germans, which we shall see coming to a head under the reign of John VIII.; for from the days of the conquest of the Avars by Charlemagne, part of the country (Pannonia) held at this period by the Moravians and other Sclavonic tribes, had been put under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishops of Salzburg and Passau. And the two brothers seem to have acted quite independently of these German authorities. Further, it is possible, as Leger suggests, that, in endeavouring to secure the co-operation of SS. Cyril and Methodius, Nicholas may have had in view the erecting of a barrier of Christian Slav states, devoted to the Church of Rome, against the impending schism of the Church of Constantinople.

The brothers go to Rome, 867–8.

To Rome, then, they went, taking with them the body of Pope St. Clement.[1] The *Italian legend* of Leo of Ostia tells us of the honourable reception accorded to the saintly brothers by Hadrian (for Nicholas had died before they reached the Eternal City) and the Roman people. The subterranean basilica of St. Clement shows a fresco

[1] Besides the *lives* of SS. Cyril and Methodius, see the letter of the librarian Anastasius to Charles the Bald, ap. Migne, t. 129, p. 741. The *Italian legend* says, Nicolaus "mandavit et ad se venire illos litteris apost. invitavit. Quo nuntio illi percepto valde gavisi sunt, gratias agentes Deo, quod tanti erant habiti quod mererentur ab Apost. sede vocari." *Acta. SS. IX.*, Martii, p. 21; Jaffé (2888). The same is stated in the Moravian, Pannonian, and Bulgarian legends, ap. *Cir. e Met.*, p. 46 f.

depicting 'a funeral procession,' and an inscription to the effect that "Hither from the Vatican is borne (Nicholas being Pope) with divine hymns the body which with aromatics he buried." This is thought to represent the translation of the body of Pope St. Clement. "The time at which these pictures were painted might be supposed rather soon after Rome was moved by the arrival of the relics than a couple of hundred years after."[1] However, for this supposition Father Mullooly, who makes it, has to maintain that, as Nicholas was dead at the time of the arrival of the relics, "the anachronism of the painter, in representing Nicholas with his nimbus accompanying the funeral procession, is deliberate." It may, indeed, easily have been so. Considering that it was Nicholas who called the saints to Rome, it was not unnatural to depict him as taking part in the translation of the relics brought by them.

Approval of the Slavonic Liturgy.

There were in the West, at the time of which we are now writing, a body of men known as 'Trilinguists,' from the opinion which they held that it was not proper for the services of the Church to be conducted in any other languages than in those used in the inscription on the Cross, viz., Latin, Greek, or Hebrew.[2] By some of these theorists opposition was made to the Slavonic liturgy of St. Cyril. However, so well did the brothers plead their cause, that the Pope not only approved of the new liturgy, but placed their translation of the Gospels on the altar of St. Peter, and took pleasure in assisting at Mass said in Slavonic. The ordination of Methodius and several of his companions was

[1] *St. Clement*, by Mullooly, p. 302. A photograph of the fresco faces p. 299. Many, of course, regard the introduction of the figure of Nicholas as a proof that the frescos were not contemporary work. *Cf. supra*, p. 14 ff.

[2] This senseless idea was carried so far that the Council of Frankfort (794, can. 52) had to pronounce anathema against such as believed that God could be only adored in three languages.

so far at once proceeded with that they were made priests.[1] Untimely death (February 14, 869) unfortunately cut short the nobly useful career of Cyril, apparently after he had been consecrated bishop.[2] Methodius, at any rate, was certainly consecrated and proclaimed archbishop of the Slavs, who inhabited the ancient province of Pannonia and the parts to the north and east of it which bordered on the territories of the Germans.[3] Of what had been thus done at Rome, Hadrian informed Rastiz in a letter which he wrote to him, to his nephew, Swatopluk, and to Kozel (or Kociel), the Slav prince of Balaton, who had begged the holy brothers to instruct him in the use of the new liturgy. The Pope speaks of the examination which had been made of the doctrine of Cyril and Methodius, and declares that "they had recognised the rights of the Holy See, and had done nothing against the canons," and that he had resolved to consecrate Methodius bishop, and "knowing him to be a man of upright mind and orthodox," to send him back to the Slavs. He approved the Slavonic liturgy, but wished that in the Mass the epistle and gospel should be read first in Latin and then Slavonic.[4]

[1] *Cf.* the *Moravian* (n. 7) and the other legends. "Apostolicus . . . . sanxit doctrinam amborum, evangelio Slovenico in altari S. Petri deposito." *Leg. Pan.*, n. 6.

[2] *Leg. Ital.*, n. 9. Hadrian decreed him the honours of a papal funeral.

[3] *Vit. Method.*, c. 8. "Factus ergo Moravorum Antistes et lucerna patriæ." *Cf. Leg. Pan.*, n. 6, etc.

[4] The Pope says he sent them Methodius "ut vos edoceret, libros in vestra lingua interpretans secundum omnia Ecclesiæ præcepta plene, cum sancta Missa, *i.e.* cum liturgia et baptismo, sicut Constantinus philosophus cœpit. . . . Hunc unum servate morem ut in Missa primo legatur Apostolus et Evangelicum latine dein slavonice." Ep. ad Rast. in Legenda Pannon., of which there is a French translation ap. Leger, p. 113. Jaffé, *Reg.*, 2924. *Cf.* the old Russian chronicler, known as Nestor. "Some began to abuse the Slavonic books, saying: 'No other nations must have a writing of their own except the Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins, as is proved by Pilate's writing on the Cross of the Saviour.' But

The burial of St. Cyril.

The document known as the *Italian legend* has a pretty story relative to the burial of St. Cyril. On the death of his brother, Methodius went to Hadrian and thus addressed him: "When we left our father's house for the country in which, with God's help, we have toiled, the last wish expressed by our mother was that, if either of us should die, the survivor would bring back his dead brother, and becomingly bury him in his monastery. Help me, your Holiness, to fulfil a mother's prayers." But when the people of Rome heard of this request, they flocked to the Pope and said: "Venerable father, it is wholly unfitting that we should allow to be taken from here the body of a man who has done such great deeds, who has enriched our Church and city with such precious relics, who, by the power of God, has drawn such distant nations towards us, and who was called to his reward from this city. So famous a man must have a famous burial-place in so famous a city as ours." Moved by their words, Hadrian decided that the saint should be buried in St. Peter's, in the very tomb he had prepared for himself. Seeing that there was no hope of his first request being granted, Methodius begged that his brother might be interred in the basilica of St. Clement, whose relics he had with such care and difficulty brought to Rome. This petition was granted, and amid the greatest pomp was the body of St. Cyril laid to rest at the right of the high-altar.

The history—somewhat tragic—of Methodius after his return to Moravia will be related under the *life* of John VIII.[1]

when the Pope of Rome heard this he blamed those who found fault with the Slavonic books, saying: 'Let the Scriptures be fulfilled, that all tongues should praise the Lord'; and if any one condemns the Slavonic writings, let him be cut off from the Church." C. 21, ed. Leger.

[1] On the above see Leger; Lapôtre, ch. iii.; Balan, *La Chiesa Cattol. e gli Slavi*, ch. iii., etc. The account of SS. Cyril and

The day on which Hadrian closed his short but full pontificate is not known. From certain catalogues, Pagi gives the date as November 26, Duchesne as December 14. Several fragments of his epitaph are still to be seen in the crypts of the Vatican. When Peter Sabinus made his copy of the greater part of it, it was in the vestibule of the sacristy of St. Peter's, where Hadrian had been buried. It ran thus:

Death of Pope Hadrian, Dec. 872.

"Ei mihi composuit mortalis pondera carnis
Hadrianus præsul. Hic sua mater humus
In cineres mersit quicquid de pulvere sumpsit,
Ast anima cælo, reddidit ossa solo.
Vir pius et placidus fuerat super æthera clarus,
Pauperibus largus, divitibusque simul.
. . . . . .
Pro quo jure Deum lachrymis venerabere visor
Ut sit cum Domino jam super astra suo."[1]
. . . . . .

On Hadrian's death, it says, mother earth here turned to dust what he had taken from it. But while his flesh returned to earth, his soul took its flight to heaven. Kind and tender was he, generous to all, and renowned throughout the world. Do you, reader, tearfully pray to God that he may live with his Lord beyond the stars.

The papal library.

The repeated mention in one papal biography after another of the name of Anastasius the librarian, will no doubt have turned the reader's thoughts on more than one occasion to that institution of which he was the guardian. The library of the popes, now, at any rate as far as manuscripts are concerned, the most valuable in the world, "the corner-stone of modern scholarship,"[2] the source whence the learned

Methodius in Butler's *Lives of the Saints* (Dec. 22) is not up to date in its presentment of the story of these great Apostles.

[1] Duchesne, *L. P.*, ii. 190; Dufresne, *Les Cryptes Vaticanes*, p. 73. The two denarii which are extant of this Pope bear on the obverse his name and that of S. Peter, and on the reverse "Ludovvicus Imp. Roma." Promis, p. 65.

[2] This is the title said to have been given to it by Mommsen a few years ago.

of every civilised land are drawing the materials wherewith to construct the history of their respective countries, had a very early, if, naturally, very humble origin. To the volumes of the Old and New Testament, which formed its appropriate base, were soon added documents of all kinds, liturgical books, letters of the popes, writings of the Fathers, lists of the occupants of the See of Rome, and of its poor, etc.[1] In thus founding a library, the Church of Rome was only doing what was being done by the other great churches even before the days of persecution were over, and settled peace was granted to the Church by Constantine. Of the character and contents of these early ecclesiastical libraries we may judge by the remark of Eusebius, the Father of Church History and the biographer of Constantine, that he found materials for his history in the library of the Church of Jerusalem, which its bishop Alexander had founded in the third century.

This primitive papal collection of books seems to have come to an untimely end in the persecution of Diocletian (303), so that of the *acts of the martyrs* collected by Pope Anterus, Gregory the Great could scarcely find a trace,[2] nor could he lay his hands on the works of so distinguished a Father as S. Irenæus.[3] But with that unconquerable patience in construction and reconstruction which has distinguished the line of Roman pontiffs, the popes at once began to form a new library as soon as peace was restored to the Church. Pope S. Damasus (305–384), a most distinctly scholarly Pope, in one of his invaluable marble

[1] *Cf.* Tertullian, *Adv. Praxeam*, c. 1. Popē Anterus (235–6) is related to have made a collection of the acts of the martyrs. "Hic gestas martyrum diligenter a notariis exquisivit et in ecclesia recondit." *L. P.*, in vit., i. 147.

[2] "In archivo hujus nostræ ecclesiæ, vel in Romanæ urbis bibliothecis." Ep. viii. 28 (29).

[3] Ep. xi. 40 (56).

inscriptions, as remarkable for their literary as for their artistic finish, tells us that, near the theatre of Pompey,[1] probably where the old library was situated, he built a new home for the papal library, with which it was his wish to have his name perpetually associated.[2] This building was in connection with the Church of S. Lawrence *in Damaso*, and it was to this *charter-house* (*chartarium*) that S. Jerome, once the secretary of Pope Damasus, referred Rufinus for a letter of Anastasius I. (400–1).[3] Henceforth there is frequent mention of the library or archives (*scrinium*) of the Roman Church and of its contents. Pope Boniface I. (418–422) refers to the 'documents of our archives,'[4] and Pope Pelagius II. (578–590) says that extracts were read to the bearers of the letters of the Istrian bishops "from the codices and ancient *polyptici* of the library of our Holy Apostolic See."[5] Less important libraries were also founded by them in different parts of the city.[6] Among these, we may specify one built by Pope Agapetus in A.D. 535. It had been his intention, in conjunction with Cassiodorus, to found a college for teachers of Christian doctrine. Before death overtook him, he had so far accomplished his design that he had erected a fine library for them, and had adorned it with a series of portraits, amongst which was one of himself. Its home was in the house on the Cœlian hill which afterwards came into the possession

[1] This item is from the *L. P.*, in vit. Dam.

[2] "Archibis, fateor, volui nova condere tecta,
Addere præterea dextra levaque columnas
Quæ Damasi teneant proprium per sæcula nomen."
Ap. *L. P.*, i. 213.

[3] *Apol. adv. Rufin.*, ii. 20. *Cf. L. P.*, in vit. Julii (337–352), for a list of different documents kept in the *scrinium* of the Roman Church.

[4] "Scrinii nostri monimenta." Jaffé, 350 (142).

[5] *Ib.* 1055 (687). St. Gregory the Great constantly speaks of 'our archives,' *e.g.* Ep. ix. 135 (49); iii. 49 (50); xii. 6 (24).

[6] Pope Hilary founded two. *Cf. L. P.*, in vit., and the notes of Duchesne 10 and 11, i. p. 247.

of S. Gregory I.; for there it was, namely, "in the library of S. Gregory," *i.e.* in that attached to the Church of S. Gregory, that the Einsiedeln pilgrim read the following inscription:

> "Here sits in long array a reverend troop,
> Teaching the mystic truths of law divine.
> 'Mid these by right takes Agapetus place,
> Who built to guard his books this fair abode
> (Codicibus pulchrum condidit arte locum).
> All toil alike, all equal grace enjoy,
> Their words are different, but their faith the same."[1]

As in process of time the work connected with the government of the Church became more and more attached to the Lateran Palace, the Library of the Holy See was, at some date unknown to us, transferred thither. The *acts* of the Roman Council of 649 prove that it was there in the seventh century. And there, just as Englishmen to-day are working in the Vatican library at the *registers* of the popes of the later Middle Ages, worked, more than a thousand years ago, the London priest Nothelm at the *registers* of the popes of the early Middle Ages for the benefit of our first historian, Bede.[2] Not long after Nothelm's visit, the Lateran library (*scrinium Lateranense*) was adorned by Pope Zachary (741–752) with a portico, towers, bronze gates, triclinium, and paintings.[3]

Moreover, just as to-day the Vatican palace has its printing press, its *Tipografia Vaticana*, so in the Middle Ages the Lateran palace had its body of copyists, whose productions enabled the popes to make presents of bibles and of liturgical and learned works to Saxon, to Frank, and to Teuton. And a letter[4] of the famous Lupus of Ferrières to Benedict III. (855–8), asking for the loan of Cicero's *de Oratore*, Quin-

[1] The version of Mr. J. W. Clark in his beautiful volume, *The Care of Books*, Cambridge, 1901. *Cf. L. P.*, i. p. 288 n.

[2] *H. E.*, i. 1. [3] *L. P.*, in vit., n. xviii.

[4] Ep. 103, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, vi.

tilian's *Institutes*, and the commentary of Donatus on Terence, is enough to show that the learned works of the library were not all ecclesiastical.

The first librarian of the Apostolic See whose name has come down to us is Gregory, afterwards the great Pope Gregory II.[1] (715–731). For some time during the following century we find the signature "of the librarian of the Holy Apostolic See" appearing on the papal bulls; and, in that same epoch, principally through the agency of Anastasius, the Lateran librarian occupied for many years no small place in the eye of the world. But it was with the librarians of the Apostolic See as with every created thing. The highest point of their power was the nearest to their decay. After the reign of Hadrian's (II.) successor, the importance of its custodian began to wane along with the library itself. The feudal horrors of the tenth century and the first part of the eleventh were not destined to render Rome a favourable spot for books or their cultivation.

On the slopes of the Palatine, near S. Maria Antiqua, Pope John VII. built a palace at the beginning of the eighth century. Perhaps in connection with it, but probably somewhat later, though at an unknown date, there was built close to and partly over the arch of Titus a strong tower, a portion of the Palatine fortifications afterwards held by the Frangipani. It was in vain that to this fort, known from its contents as the Cartulary Tower[2] (Turris Chartularia), part of the papal archives were for greater safety's sake transferred[3]; it was to no purpose that its

[1] *L. P.*, in vit.

[2] The *Mirabilia Urbis Romæ* says that the tower was "therefore called Cartulary because there was a common library there." Eng. trans., p. 101. *Cf. Graphia U. R.*, ap. Urlichs, *Codex U. R. topog.*, p. 121.

[3] Hence Deusdedit, *Collect. can.*, p. 315, quotes not only from the papyrus volumes of the Lateran, but also from those he found in the

contents were recruited from time to time by presents and, towards the end of the tenth century, by tributes of books from monasteries directly subject to the Roman See[1]; the terrible disorders of the time and the disastrous fire in the Lateran quarter enkindled by the Norman Guiscard (1084) seem to have destroyed at least the greater part of the second library of the popes. On a future occasion we may tell how a third papal library was destroyed during the internal troubles in Rome in the course of the thirteenth century, and by the defection from the popes of the Frangipani, who handed over the Cartulary Tower to Frederick II. (1244). Even then, before the foundation of the present Vatican library by Nicholas V. (1447–1455), there would still remain to be discussed the library of the popes of the thirteenth century, with its new series of papal registers dating from that of Innocent III.; the library of Boniface VIII.; and that of the Avignon popes and its wanderings till the glorious days of Nicholas V.[2]

Cartulary Tower (*juxta Palladium*). "Hæc itaque quæ secuntur sumpta sunt ex tomis Lateranensis Bybliothecæ. . . . Itaque in alio carticio tomo inveni juxta Palladium." *Cf.* p. 317. This tower seems to have been the same as the *Testamentum* of the Einsiedeln Itinerary. *Cf.* Lanciani's ed. of it, p. 68; and Montfaucon's *Travels*, Eng. ed., p. 207.

[1] Deusdedit, p. 321.

[2] The chief authorities are, for the earlier libraries, G. B. de Rossi, *De origine, historia, etc. Bibliothecæ S. Apost. commentatio*, Rome, 1886, and *La Biblioteca della Sede Apost.*, Rome, 1884; and for the later, Father F. Ehrle, *Historia Bib. RR. PP. tum Bonifatianæ tum Avenionesis*, Rome, 1890. *Cf.* also *La Biblioteca Vaticana*, Rome, 1893, by I. Carini, and *La Bibliothèque Vaticane*, by Paul Fabre, forming a section of *Le Gouvernement de l'Église*, Paris.

JOHN VIII.

A.D. 872–882.

Sources.—Here for the first time the *Liber Pontificalis* fails us. The most complete MS. of it closes with an unfinished notice of Stephen (V.) VI. Whether contemporary biographies of John VIII., Marinus I., and Hadrian III. were ever written is not known, but it is certain that no traces of them have come down to us. What served as a continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis* from John VIII. to the end of the eleventh century was a mere catalogue, generally very short, but occasionally furnished with a few notes, and drawn up at intervals by contemporaries. Duchesne has shown[1] that the catalogue, as it was originally produced, has not been best preserved for us in the MS. "Laurentianus LXV. 35," as Watterich thought, but in what we may call the second part of the *Liber Pontificalis*, viz., in the MS. of *Peter William*. The *Liber Pontificalis* of this monk, who was the librarian of the Priory of St. Giles, "de Aceio," in the diocese of Rheims, and who in 1142 wrote out a MS. which has come down to us, contains (1) the lives of the popes from St. Peter to Hadrian II., according to the old *Liber Pontificalis*, but interpolated here and there, and, from the middle of the eighth century, considerably abridged; (2) the Catalogue above alluded to; (3) extended biographies from Gregory VII. to Honorius II. (1073–1130), drawn up by contemporaries.

Of the *Catalogue* from John VIII. to the end of the eleventh century, which was in circulation before the compilation of Peter William, there are various copies, all abridged

[1] *L. P.*, ii., introduc.

from the one preserved by Peter, but sometimes supplied with small additions of their own, which are occasionally useful enough. During this period regular *lives* of the popes were probably not written. The clergy of the Roman court had, most unfortunately, something else to think about during the stormy period of the tenth century and the first part of the eleventh than writing biographies. However, that the tradition of the old *Book of the Popes* might not fail absolutely, some Roman clerics found opportunity from time to time to draw up the *Catalogue* as a sort of continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis*. However, on turning to the *Catalogue* (ap. Duchesne, or Watterich), it would appear at first sight that we had a regular biography of John VIII. But the fact is, that Peter William himself added a notice of John, drawn from two of his letters, in connection with his monastery of St. Giles.

If the *Book of the Popes* fails us, we have an exceptional source for the biography of John, viz., a part of his 'register.' There is actually preserved in the Vatican Library a very ancient MS. containing the letters of the last six years (or indictions rather) of the reign of John, *i.e.* from September 1, 876. Lapôtre, in the fascinating chapter in which he opens his life of this Pope, gives excellent reasons to show that this MS. is a fragment of the *original* register itself and not a copy. He even goes a step further. From the facts that (i) the canonists of the twelfth century have made no quotations from the existing MS., which begins at the tenth indiction (September 1, 876), and which we *know* was *not* in the Lateran when they made their compilations; and that (ii) on the contrary they have made extracts from all the other indictions of the other half of the register (since lost) *except the ninth*, he draws the startling conclusion that the original register was mutilated by the party of Formosus, who destroyed the documents belonging to the ninth indiction. This they did because it was that indiction (September 875 to September 876) which saw their unsparing condemnation by John VIII.

Three hundred and eighty-two of his letters have been published by Migne[1] (*P. L.*, t. 126); fifteen more by Loewenfeld (*Epp. Pont. R. ined.*, 1885), and a few others elsewhere. Of especial

[1] Augustine Mau is preparing an edition of the letters of John VIII. for the *M. G. Epp.*

importance among the last-named are the fragments in the collection of canons found by Mr. E. Bishop, in the British Museum, and published in the fifth volume of the *Neues Archiv* and in the new edition of Jaffé. Some of these fragments treat of the work of S. Methodius in Moravia.

This is not the first time that allusion has been made by me to Mr. Bishop's discovery. As no account of it has, I believe, appeared in English; and as it adds to previously known historical sources parts at least of some 233 new letters of divers popes, and is therefore one of the most important discoveries of medieval documents which has been made in recent years, I may be allowed to say a few words about it here. Kindly showing me, in the year 1901, in the British Museum, a bound manuscript (Addit. 8873), Mr. Bishop told me that he had there came across it some twenty years before. It had been acquired by the Museum in 1831. On examination it proved to date from the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century. It consisted of 210 leaves, and was apparently all written by one hand, though after f. 126, where the rubrics ended, there was room for a doubt on that point. The list of its contents with which the MS. begins, shows that it was one of those *collections of canons* which were of such frequent production at the epoch when it was written. This particular collection is especially useful, as it contains extracts not only from the Pandects of Justinian but from registers of the popes now lost. It affords perhaps the first evidence we have of the use of the Pandects in medieval Europe. But here we are most concerned with the extracts which it contains from the papal archives. The earliest pope whose epistles it has used is Pope Gelasius I., the latest, Urban II. Of this latter Pope it quotes from no less than 31 letters previously unknown. More to our present purpose are the thirty fragments from the lost first four books of the register of John VIII.

In making a careful study and transcription of this valuable document, Mr. Bishop spent eighteen months of hard work. When it was accomplished, to our lasting shame be it spoken, the copy was sent to Germany, as no one in this country seemed to be interested in it. It was joyfully accepted by the editors of the *Monumenta Germaniæ*, and it was through their grateful acknowledgments to Mr. Bishop for his gift in their various

prefaces, that the present writer first became acquainted with the great addition to the sources of medieval history which he had made. To them[1] or to some other foreigner must the reader turn, if he would know more of the MS. Addit. 8873.

If the letters of John are not remarkable for their literary style, it must be remembered that the letters of his 'register,' at least, are in the nature of drafts and not copies of the finished productions.

In addition to the annals as before, a new authority for the biographies of the popes begins now to make its appearance. It is the metrical notices of the popes by Frodoard, a canon of Rheims, who visited Rome in the days of Leo VII. (936–9). Born in 894, near Rheims, his learning and piety gained for him the priesthood and the care of the archives of the Cathedral of Rheims. Before his death (966) he had written several works; among them a poem, *De Christi triumphis ap. Ital.*, in which he gives short notices of the popes from St. Peter to Leo VII., generally drawn from the *Liber Pontificalis*. But what he has to say of John VIII. and his successors to Leo VII., he has extracted for the most part from their epitaphs and their correspondence with the archbishops of Rheims. In his rather longer account of Leo, who gave him a most cordial reception, and who is the last pontiff touched on by him, personal reminiscences enter in. The poem of Frodoard has been published, after Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ord. Ben.*, Sæc. iii. p. ii.), by Muratori (*R. I. S.*, iii. p. ii.); Migne, *P. L.*, t. 135, in full, and, as far as important parts from John VIII. onwards are concerned, by Duchesne, *L. P.*, ii. p. x. f.; and Watterich in the first volume of his collection of original lives of the popes.

Modern Works.—L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque Carolingienne, première partie, *Le Pape Jean VIII.*, par A. Lapôtre, S.J., Paris, 1895. This work, a production of the very first order, combines the results of the most painstaking research with the keenest historical deduction. If its author takes many a flight into the realm of conjecture, it must be confessed that he does so on strong wings. In a work such as the present, it cannot be expected that we should always follow him in his aerial career. To show how the court (*entourage*) of John VIII. amused

[1] *Neues Archiv*, v. 1880. *Cf.* also *Revue des Quest. Hist.*, October 1880.

itself, the same author, under the title of *Le Souper de Jean Diacre*, has published (ap. *Mélanges d'archéol. et d'hist.*, 1901–2) a most informing and critical article on an edition in verse by John the Deacon of the curious prose piece known as the *Coena Cypriani*. Lapôtre's commentaries on John's prologue, epilogue, and dedicatory letter to John VIII. prove that they throw light on the history of the period. A shorter biography more on the lines of this work is *Il pontificato di Giovanni VIII.*, del Pietro Balan, Roma, 1880. We have made the freest use of both works. Another biography, cited by Lapôtre, and favourably noticed in the *English Histor. Rev.*, iii. 396, but which we have not been able to procure, has been written by A. Gasquet, *Jean VIII. et la fin de l'Emp. Carol.*, Clermont-Ferrand, 1886. It seems to have been only privately printed, and to have been incorporated with his *L'empire Byzantin*.

Emperor of the East.	Emperors of the West.
Basil I. (the Macedonian),[1] 867-886.	Louis II., 850–875.
	Charles II. (the Bald), 875–877.
	Charles III. (the Fat), 881–888.

Modern historians and John VIII.

JOHN VIII., like all great men, made enemies in plenty. And in the nineteenth century, well nigh as many looked askance at him as did in the ninth. That John VIII. really was a great man is what, in unison with Gregorovius, we imagine will be conceded by all. He opens his account of John VIII., a Pope "yet more vigorous" than Hadrian II., thus: "The Church, however, was fortunate at this time in having a succession of popes no less able than those who had freed Rome from the Byzantine yoke. While the throne of the Carolingians was occupied by a series of ever weaker rulers, the chair of Peter was filled

[1] I have examined an old biography of this emperor (*Basilio il Macedone*, Roma, 1809) by G. Impaccianti. But as the author, taking Xenophon's *Cyropædia* for his model, has added invented material to edify, his work has no particular historical value. See pp. vi and vii of his introduction.

by a set of men immeasurably their superiors in diplomatic skill, firmness, and power."[1] . . . John's energy against the inroads of the Saracens causes the same author to exclaim (p. 181): "The activity which the priest displayed put kings to shame, and covered his memory with military renown. A man such as the Pope well deserved to govern Rome"; and (p. 200): "When we read the Pope's letters, we are forced to admire his diplomatic skill. He possessed a capacity for political finesse such as but few popes have shared." Finally (p. 205): "He was distinguished by gifts of intellect and energy of will so rare, that his name shines with royal splendour in the temporal history of the papacy between the times of Nicholas I. and Gregory VII."

That, despite this, Gregorovius should regard John (p. 199) as "revengeful to an almost unequalled degree," as (p. 204) "totally absorbed in aims of temporal dominion" and "ambiguous, intriguing, sophistic, unscrupulous," need not surprise us, when we find a Catholic author like Cantu[2] asserting that John VIII. was "intriguing and passionate, formed very false judgments on the morality of acts, was prodigal with excommunications, converted penance into pilgrimages, and allowed himself to be befooled by Photius." To form an accurate estimate of the character of John may well be difficult, when we have Baronius[3] assigning to John's *weakness* of character the origin of the fable of Pope Joan, and Photius repeatedly[4] praising him for his *manliness*. Here we will only observe that whatever moderns

[1] *Rome*, iii. 170. Fisher, *The Medieval Empire*, ii. p. 137-9, calls John VIII. "the most vigorous diplomatist and warrior of his time, the Julius II. of the ninth century," and adds, "the political force of the Papacy died with John VIII."

[2] *Storia degli Italiani*, v. 350. *Cf.* Lapôtre, p. x.

[3] *Annal.*, ad an. 879, n. 5. Gasquet speaks of him (*L'empire byzant.*, p. 428) as "sans fermeté et sans suite dans ses volontés."

[4] *De S. Spiritus mystagogia*, c. 89, ap. *P. G.*, t. 102, pp. 379–82.

may think of John, his contemporaries in the West[1] speak of him as highly as does Photius in the East. The panegyrist[2] of Formosus unites with the schismatical patriarch in eulogising the untiring struggle of John against wrong. Later on we may add a word of our own on the character of John VIII. Meanwhile it must be stated who he was and what he did.

John before he became Pope.

In the Roman Council of 853 we find the signature of a certain 'archdeacon John.'[3] Sixteen years later, one of the allocutions of Pope Hadrian against Photius in the Roman synod of 869 was read[4] by the same archdeacon; "and on December 14,[5] 872," as we are informed by the annals of the time, "John, archdeacon of the Roman Church, was substituted in place of Pope Hadrian." That the new Pope was by birth a Roman and the son of Gundus,[6] and that Formosus, bishop of Porto, had endeavoured to thwart his election as Pope[7] by securing his own, is all the further information we have to give of John before he ascended the chair of Peter. From the long time that he held the important office of archdeacon, and from frequent allusions in his letters to the weak state of his health, we may fairly conclude that he was not only at least somewhat advanced in years when he became Pope, but that he was also of feeble health.

[1] *Ann. Xantenses* (*M. G. SS.*, ii.), ad an. 872. "Vir præclarus nomine Johannes." Both John's epitaph (see end of this biography) and Frodoard (ap. Watterich, i. 636) allude to a part of the Pope's work which Gregorovius has not noticed, and which shows the exaggeration of that historian's language when he speaks of John's mind being completely taken up with temporal affairs, viz., his efforts for the conversion of the Moravians.

"De Christi segete crebro zizania pellens
Et rationabiles per agros pia semina spargens."

[2] *Invectiva in Romam*, ap. Migne, t. 129, p. 830.

[3] Labbe, viii. 124.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 1087.

[5] Hinc., *Annal.*, ad an. 872.

[6] The *Catalogue*.

[7] Joan., Ep. 24; Lapôtre, p. 31, n. 2.

The conversion of the Moravians.

In recounting the deeds of this heroic Pontiff, we will begin with what he did for the Moravians, in order to continue their history with as short a break as possible. Before the death of Hadrian, Methodius, as archbishop of Pannonia, *i.e.* seemingly of Sirimium, had returned[1] with a light heart to work among his beloved Slavs. For with the episcopal character he had received from Hadrian, he would be able to establish a native hierarchy, and win the confidence of the people still further by being able, now that he had secured the approval of the Holy See, to propagate freely the Liturgy in their own language. But as in the case of most other works which are calculated to do great good, the conversion of the Moravians was not to be allowed to proceed smoothly. The efforts of Methodius were to be interfered with as well by German princes as by German ecclesiastics. The former had designs on the country held by the Slavs, and the latter regarded Methodius as an intruder, seeing that it was through their efforts that Christianity had long before been introduced into various of the Slav tribes on the German boundaries, and that, as we have seen, they regarded Moravia as ecclesiastically subject to the bishops of Passau and Salzburg.

Methodius carried captive into Germany, 871.

Hardly had Methodius reached Moravia, and put himself in touch again with the different Slavonic peoples, when, through the secret support of Swatopluk, the nephew of Rastiz, not only was the power of the Moravian monarch broken by the Germans, but he himself and Methodius along with him were carried off prisoners into Germany. By the comparatively recent discovery in the British

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 223, and the Pannonian Legend, c. 9. Kociel, prince of Pannonia, the country south of Moravia, had written in the meanwhile asking Pope Hadrian to send Methodius to him. Hadrian replied, that he was sending him to all the Slavonic countries. *Leg. Pan.*, n. 8.

Museum of extracts, at least, of certain of the earlier letters of John, we now know something of our saint's treatment there. Brought before a council where he was unmercifully bullied, and treated most shamefully,[1] he was afterwards, viz., at the end of the year 871, cast into a cruel dungeon in an old tower, where he languished, exposed to cold and rain, for two and a half years. The barbarian in these Teutons was as yet covered with but a very thin skin of Christian feeling and conduct, and that skin was very easily broken. Every effort was made to keep the Pope, to whom Methodius at once appealed, in ignorance of what had passed. Anno of Freising, one of the very bishops who had condemned Methodius, nay, who had been the very soul of the opposition to him, even declared to the Pope (873) that he knew nothing about him.[2] When, however, at length, towards the end of the first half of this year (873), John learnt, at least, much of the truth, he at once despatched a legate (Paul of Ancona) to Bavaria.

John's instructions to his legate, May 873.

The *instructions* given to Paul by the Pope[3] will serve admirably to put the reader in possession of the points at issue between the Germans and Methodius, and of ideas on the firmness and justice of John VIII. Paul was to remind the king (Louis the German) that Pannonia (*Pannonica diocesis*) was of old subject to the Apostolic See, and that from the earliest times (*antiquitus*) the disposition of bishoprics throughout the whole of Illyricum (*totius Illyrici fines*) belonged to it. Ecclesiastical[4] rights may, indeed,

[1] "Colaphis affligentes." Instructions of John VIII. to his legate Paul of Ancona, ap. *Neues Archiv*, v. *Cf. Vit. Method.*, c. 9; John's letter to Ermenrich, bishop of Passau; and *Annal. Fuld.*, ad an. 870. Jaffé, 2976 (2248), 2977.

[2] Ep. Joan. ad Ann. Frising., ap. *Neues Archiv*, v.; Jaffé, 2797. "Te illum nosse mentiendo negasti."

[3] Jaffé, 2976 (2248), or ap. *Cyrillo e Metod.*, 102. *Cf.* John's letters to Anno and Hermenrich, *ib.*

[4] The Pope, writing (Ep. 5, p. 654) to the same Louis on another

in certain cases be lost by a contrary prescription, but not where an existing state of things has been upset by an invasion of pagans. The German bishops must be given clearly to understand that Methodius must be restored before any case against him can be considered. When he has been in possession of his See for as long a time as he has through them been deprived of it, then, if they have anything against him, both parties must come to Rome. Paul himself must not put off going to Swatopluk with Methodius, on account of any rumour of war. "Those who are in the service of St. Peter are men of peace, and wherever they go are not to be hindered by wars from working for the public weal."

Although Paul was instructed to prohibit the use of the Slav liturgy,[1] the German bishops were, as we have seen, peremptorily ordered, under pain of suspension, to restore Methodius to liberty, and to come to Rome if they wished to accuse him.[2] In a number of other letters King Louis the German is put in possession of the Pope's view of the case. Anno of Freising and his episcopal partners in oppressing Methodius are severely reprimanded for their arrogance in condemning an archbishop sent out by the Apostolic See, and for their brutal treatment of him; and Alwin, archbishop of Salzburg, is commanded to atone for his

occasion, but about the same time, says that no prescription can avail against the privileges of the Holy See, and that the civil laws themselves require a prescription of a hundred years where there is question of the property of the Roman Church. And we may note in passing that the claim of Salzburg to Pannonia did not date further back than 798.

[1] Ep. 239, ad. Method. "Jam litteris nostris per Paulum ep. Anconitanum tibi directis prohibuimus ne in ea lingua (Sclavina) sacra missarum solemnia celebrares: sed vel in Latina, vel in Græca lingua, sicut Ecclesia Dei toto orbe terrarum diffusa et in omnibus gentibus dilatata cantat."

[2] Lapôtre, p. 121. The letters of John on this subject are from the *Collectio Britannica*, Jaffé, 2970–2980.

conduct by being the first to see to the restoration of Methodius.

Methodius is accused of heterodoxy, 879.

At once released,[1] the apostle of the Slavs returned to Moravia to find it again becoming a powerful state under the guidance of Swatopluk, who, after using the Germans to overthrow his uncle, then successfully opposed them on his own account. But blows and imprisonment on German soil were not to be the last of the troubles of Methodius. The good work he was once more accomplishing in Moravia received yet another check. There were unfortunately at the court of the Slav monarch two men who were jealous of the influence which his virtues gave to the Byzantine archbishop. To ruin him, these men, John of Venice, a priest, and Wiching, a German, accused him to the Pope of not adding the 'Filioque' to the Creed, a custom which, as we have seen, though supported by Charlemagne, had not even yet been introduced into the Roman Church.[2] What seemed still more likely to work his downfall with John was the accusation they made to the effect that Methodius, despite the Pope's orders to the contrary, had continued to use the Slavonic tongue in the liturgy. "The archbishop of the Church of Pannonia" was promptly (879) ordered to come to Rome, that "we may hear from your own mouth whether you believe and preach as in word and writing you promised the Holy Roman Church that you would."[3] This summons the archbishop obeyed immediately.

[1] *Leg. Pan.*, n. 10.

[2] *Cf.* vol. ii., p. 62 ff., of this work. Comparing what is there said and what is said above, it will be seen how *outré* is the remark of Gregorovius (*Rome*, iii. 200), John "set the judgment of his orthodox contemporaries and of future generations at defiance, esteeming political advantage of greater importance than the dogmatic subtleties of the *filioque*."

[3] Ep. 239. "Unde his apostolatus nostri litteris tibi jubemus ut, ... ad nos de præsenti venire procures, ut ex ore tuo audiamus

Methodius declared orthodox.

Soon convinced of his orthodoxy and good sense, John wrote[1] (880) to Swatopluk, 'glorious count.' He began by praising the devotion of the count and his people to the Apostolic See and himself. "For, inspired by divine grace, and setting at naught other princes of this world, with all your faithful nobility and people, you have chosen to have as your patron and helper and defender in all things Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and his vicar." The venerable archbishop Methodius "we have examined in presence of our brother bishops," as to whether he holds the same faith as the Roman Church. John then goes on to state that, finding him thoroughly orthodox, he confirmed his mission and station. Unfortunately, however, in accordance with the wishes of Swatopluk, as he expresses it, he consecrated Wiching to be bishop of Nitra (on the Nitra). It is true he ordered this enemy of Methodius "to be in all things subject to his archbishop." Swatopluk is next asked to send out another cleric, with the approval of Methodius, so that John may also consecrate him bishop. The three thus consecrated will then be able canonically to consecrate such other bishops as may be required. Finally, he approves of the Slavonic tongue to be used in the Mass and in the liturgy of the Church generally[2]; for God, "who made the three principal languages, Hebrew,

utrum sic teneas et sic prædices sicut verbis et litteris te sanctæ R. ecclesiæ credere promisisti." *Cf.* Ep. 238, p. 849, to "Tuventarus de Marauna," *i.e.*, to Zuvatapu de Maravná, Swatopluk of Moravia, in which the Pope explains to the Slav monarch why he has ordered Methodius to come to Rome.

[1] Ep. 293, p. 904 f.

[2] Ep. 239. "Litteras denique Sclavonicas . . . . jure laudamus; et in eadem lingua Christi D. N. præconia et opera ut enarrentur jubemus. . . . Nec sane fidei vel doctrinæ aliquid obstat sive missas in eadem Slavonica lingua canere, sive sacrum Evangelium, vel lectiones divinas N. et V. Testamenti, bene translatas et interpretatas legere, aut alia horarum officia omnia psallere." *Cf. vit. Method.*

Greek, and Latin, made the others also for His honour and glory. However, in all the churches of your land we order that, for the sake of honour, the Gospel be first read in Latin and then in Slavonic, and, if you and your judges wish to have Mass said in Latin, that it be so done for you."

Renewed opposition to Methodius, 880.

Methodius was no sooner back again in Moravia than the German, Wiching, who was likely enough a secret agent of Arnulf, duke of Carinthia, began again to obstruct the good work of the saint (880). The efforts of Methodius, if allowed to develop naturally, would have not only made the Moravians Christians, but probably a powerful united nation also. This would not have suited the Germans. Wiching accordingly gave out that he was the bearer of other letters and secret instructions from the Pope, which were quite to the opposite effect to those which Methodius professed to have. Methodius and his liturgy, declared the lying German, were to be driven forth by the Pope's[1] authority. In despair, Methodius once again (881) turned to John, and informed him of all that had been said by Wiching. On March 23, 881, came back a letter[2] from the Pope. He praised the saint's zeal for souls, his orthodoxy, and denied that he had sent any other letters to Swatopluk than the one with which Methodius was acquainted, or that he had given any commission whatsoever to Wiching.[3] He

[1] *Cf.* c. 12, *in vit. Method.*

[2] Ep. 319, p. 928.

[3] *Ib.* "Neque aliæ litteræ nostræ ad eum [Sfentopulcum, as the Pope calls him] directæ sunt, neque episcopo illi (no doubt Wiching) palam vel secreto aliud faciendum injunximus, et aliud a te peragendum decrevimus, quanto minus credendum est ut sacramentum ab eodem episcopo exegerimus, quem saltem levi sermone super hoc negotio allocuti non fuimus." To further smooth the path of Methodius, John wrote to Muntimir, duke of Schiavonia or Serbia (the country between the Drave and the Save), who, under German influence, had shown himself indisposed to submit to the newly appointed archbishop of the Slavs. John reproved his obstinacy, and exhorted him to due ecclesiastical submission to the archbishop. Fejer, *Cod. Diplom. Hungar.*, i. 196, ap. Jaffé, 2973 (2259).

entreated him not to be cast down by the various trials which had befallen him, but rather, with the apostle, to consider them a joy. However, he will not fail in due course to chastise the offences of the aforesaid bishop.

Triumph and death of Methodius, 885

The reception of this letter enabled Methodius to prove before the Moravian assembly, which had come together expecting to hear of the expulsion of their beloved apostle, that he had the full approval of Rome in all that he was doing.[1]

Condemnation of the Slav liturgy by Stephen VI., 885.

This silenced Wiching for a time. But when, worn out with the labours of a life devoted to the welfare of his fellowmen, Methodius had died (April 6, 885), Wiching succeeded, by his forgeries and duplicity, in leading Stephen (V.) VI. to believe that Pope John had actually condemned Methodius and his Slavonic liturgy. Believing, then, and stating in as many words, that he was following in the footsteps of his great predecessor, Stephen definitely condemned the use of Slavonic in the sacred liturgy (885), whilst bestowing praise upon the traitor Wiching.[2] This and the Germanising influence of Wiching proved fatal to the ideas and disciples of Methodius. They were expelled the country and betook themselves to Boris of Bulgaria. The liturgy of the Moravians was transported to the Slavs of the East and North, and their liberty was

[1] "Tum congregati omnes Moravici homines jusserunt coram se recitari epistolam ut audirent expulsionem ejus. . . . Honorantes autem apostolicos libros invenerunt scripturam: Frater noster Methodius sanctus, orthodoxus est, apostolicum opus perfecit," etc. C. 12, *in vit. Method.*

[2] Jaffé, 3407 (2649). The date (885) is the one adopted by Lapôtre, p. 168. When war broke out between Swatopluk and King Arnulf (892), Wiching at once went over to the German and became Arnulf's chancellor. (Hergenröther, *Hist.*, iii. § 243, p. 517.) Balan, indeed (*Gli Slavi*, c. 4), contends, with no little acumen, that neither Hadrian nor John had ever, as a matter of fact, given permission for anything more than that sermons might be given, and the gospel in the Mass read, in Slavonic.

destroyed by the Germans and Hungarians. By these powerful forces the Slavs were divided once for all into two great parties, as well in religion as in politics. But for the incursions of the Hungarians, a further effort to shake off German domination, which was made by Moimir II., the son of Swatopluk (†894), might have succeeded. At his request John IX. sent him an archbishop and two bishops to reorganise a national hierarchy—a proceeding which greatly annoyed[1] the Bavarian bishops. But, as we have said, the Moravian kingdom was swept away at the beginning of the tenth century by the whirlwind of the Magyar cavalry.

In this sketch of Moravia and the popes of the ninth century, the conclusions of Lapôtre have been adopted. For the arguments on which he rests these conclusions the reader must be referred to that author. Like an able barrister dealing with circumstantial evidence, he has in a most remarkable manner pieced together and harmonised what seemed to be not merely the isolated, but even the contradictory records of antiquity.

It is not the place here to speculate as to what might have been the future history of the Slavs, politically and religiously, if the policy of John in allowing the Slav liturgy had been persevered in. Suffice it to reaffirm here that it was not. Stephen (V.) VI., deceived by Wiching, as we have said, as to what John had really done, proscribed[2] (*c.* 885) the Slav liturgy. Its condemnation was renewed by John X.[3] (914–928) and other popes. However, even among the Slavs who remained in union with Rome it must have survived in some way; and, in 1248, the bishop

Partial leave granted later on, 1248.

[1] See their letter to the Pope (ap. Labbe, ix. 498, or Mansi, xviii.). *Cf.* Hergenröther, *Hist.*, iii. 517; Leger, 163 f.

[2] Jaffé, 3407 (2649); Lapôtre, p. 127 f.

[3] Farlati, *Illy. Sacr.*, iii. 93 f.; Jaffé, 3571 f. (2736 f.).

of Zengh (Austrian Croatia) begged Pope Innocent IV. to allow the celebration of the Roman liturgy in the Sclavonic tongue, but written out in characters invented by St. Jerome, *i.e.* as we suppose, in Glagolitic characters. Innocent gave the required permission for the employment of the Slavonic liturgy in those parts where the 'special characters' were in use. It is the words which must be subordinated to the matter, and not the matter to the words, wrote the Pope.[1] At first the permission seems to have been very largely used. The 'Glagolita rite' was at one time common throughout Dalmatia, Bosnia, Servia, and Bulgaria, and various Glagolita missals, etc., were printed from time to time in Rome. Now the use of this extremely curious rite has shrunk to the four dioceses of Veglia, Zara, Spalato, and Sbenico.

Croatia.

In addition to the Slavs of Lake Balaton, Schiavonia, and Moravia, John's interest and concern for that people extended also to the Slavs of Croatia. The Christianity established in Croatia under the direction of the Dalmatian Pope John IV. had not been able to exist long.

However, when John VIII. became Pope there were among the Croatians a number of priests, Germans, and Greeks from various parts, who were anything but calculated to convert them. According to the epistle which the Pope wrote to Muntimir, duke of Croatia,[2] they were doing more harm than good, breaking the laws both of the Church and of God himself; and, as they were not subject to any recognised superior, could not be checked. Muntimir is exhorted in the same letter to follow the examples of his forefathers, and to place himself under the spiritual direction of Methodius, archbishop

[1] The letter is dated at Lyons, March 29 (not 19, as in Neale), 1248; Potthast, *Regest.*, ii. 12880. *Cf.* Neale's *Notes on Dalmatia*, ch. iv., and d'Avril, *St. Cyrille*, p. 250 f.

[2] An. 873, Jaffé, 2973 (2259).

of the neighbouring Pannonia. Whatever effect this letter had upon Muntimir, it is certain that in 879 his successor, King Branimir, made his submission to the See of Rome. John wrote[1] to thank him, "because, by the mercy of God, like a beloved son, he desired to be faithful in all things and obedient to St. Peter and to himself. . . . With paternal love he received him returning to the bosom of his holy mother, the Apostolic See, whence your fathers drank of the honeyed waters of saving preaching. . . . In all your acts ever have God before your eyes. Fear and love Him with your whole heart." In the following year, after the Pope had consecrated a bishop for the Croatians, he writes[2] once more to the "glorious count Branimir, and to all his religious priests, honourable judges, and to all the people." After again thanking God for the devotion they had shown to the See of Peter, he exhorts them to persevere in the service of Blessed Peter, under whose "guidance, rule, and protection" they had placed themselves.[3] John concludes this letter by instructing Branimir, if he would have his wishes fulfilled, "to send suitable envoys to us, who, on your part, may take counsel with us and the Apostolic See on the matters which you have written to us, so that we also may send a legate to you, *to whom* (viz., to the combined envoys of the Pope and

[1] Ep. 229. "Et quia, Deo favente, quasi dilectus filius S. Petro et nobis . . . . fidelis in omnibus et obediens esse cupias, humiliter profiteris, tuæ nobilitati dignas valde gratias . . . . agimus." This letter and the next one, addressed to the priests and people of Branimir's kingdom, in which they are exhorted to perseverance, are both dated June 7, 879. The one sent to Theodosius, the deacon and bishop elect of Nona (a little south of the present province of Croatia), is dated June 4. In it Theodosius is told to come to Rome for episcopal consecration. Ep. 225. *Cf.* Ep. 234.

[2] Ep. 307.

[3] *Ib.* "Qui sub ala, et regimine atque defensione B. Petri ap. et nostra toto conamine vos subdere, atque in ejus servitio perseverare, quasi dilecti filii procurastis," etc.

king), *according to the manner and custom of our Church, your whole people may promise fidelity.*"[1]

Slav peoples place themselves under the protection of the Holy See.

This letter is the more interesting that it reveals the fact that Branimir had followed the example of the Moravian chief, Swatopluk,[2] and had placed himself and his people under the protectorate of the Holy See. "And thus it was the Slavs who began that great movement which led so many kings and nations in the Middle Ages to seek in the suzerainty of the popes a support for their weakness or a title for contested power."[3] Was it not but natural that tribes should look up with respectful gratitude to the common father of all the faithful, through whom with the incomparable blessings of the Christian faith they received the substantial benefits of civilisation? Was it not to be expected that men surrounded by dangerous enemies should seek protection from one who had given to them in their weakness the same blessings he had before bestowed upon their more powerful foes, and who, they knew, must have great influence with their opponents, as he was the common spiritual father of both of them? The influence which the popes acquired in the Middle Ages sprang from the respect begotten of the loving gratitude of men who had been christianised and civilised by them. No student of history can call in question the assertion that the greatest factor in the civilisation of the West was the hierarchy established and sustained by the bishops of Rome. That our fathers in this country, "who" says an old

[1] *Ib.* "Quapropter mandamus ut . . . . idoneos legatos vestros præsentialiter ad nos dirigere non prætermittatis, qui pro parte omnium vestrum nos et sedem apostolicam consulant, de his quæ mandastis, ut et nos cum illis missum nostrum dirigamus ad vos, quibus secundum morem et consuetudinem Ecclesiæ nostræ universus populus vester fidelitatem promittat."

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 242.

[3] Lapôtre, p. 128.

chronicler,[1] "are ever great lovers of the Apostolic See," were ever giving of their gold to the popes, ever braving every peril of land and sea to visit them, and ever dedicating most of their churches to St. Peter, was due to the fact that they remembered St. Gregory the Great. But as grown-up children sometimes forget and even despise the parents who tended and protected them in their helplessness, so the popes are nowadays at times despised by peoples who have only grown to their present strength by the fostering care of the Roman pontiffs.[2]

Efforts to reclaim Bulgaria, 878–879.

With his eye turned towards the Slavs, it was not likely that John would forget the Bulgarians, who, with a dalliance between Rome and Constantinople, which was repeated in the nineteenth century, had connected themselves, as we have[3] seen, in the matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction with the latter. John tried everything to bring them back under the direct authority of the See of Rome. He wrote to Boris[4] himself and his chief men on the one hand, and to the emperor Basil and St. Ignatius, and afterwards to Photius, on the other. It was not, as the Pope said to Boris,[5] that the faith taught by Rome and Constantinople was not in itself one and the same; but that the patriarchs of Constantinople and the Greeks were very prone to schism and to error, as he knew but too well. It was the wish of the Pope, consequently, to save the Bulgarians from attaching

[1] *Gesta Abbatum Fontanell.*, ab an. 747-753, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii. p. 289. The writer is speaking "de Brittania, id est de gente Anglorum, qui maxime familiares Apostolicæ Sedis semper existunt."

[2] Other extant correspondence of John with Slav princes shows him using his influence with them for the general good. Writing to a certain Domagoï (Jaffé, 2998 or 2585, 1st ed.), a duke of the Slavs, doubtless of those on the Adriatic, he exhorts him to put down those who, "feigning to act in his name, are ever harrying Christians," and preying upon merchantmen.

[3] *Supra*, p. 214.

[4] Jaffé, 2962, 2996. *Cf.* 2999 to Basil, to summon Ignatius to Rome.

[5] Ep. 108.

themselves to the Greeks, and thereby sooner or later losing their faith. It was with the view of detaching them from Constantinople that he was induced, in the opinion at least of some authors, to recognise Photius as patriarch on the death of Ignatius. And as a matter of fact, Photius himself never interfered in the ecclesiastical government of Bulgaria, which was henceforth no longer inserted in the episcopal lists of the patriarch of Constantinople.[1] If John did not attain his end, it was because of the ideas of unbounded independence entertained by the Bulgarians; or, perhaps it should rather be said, because of the ideas of absolutism conceived by the Bulgarian rulers. They would be the first in the Church as in the State. They were soon, however, and were long so to remain, the subjects of Constantinople in both.

A full analysis of John's first extant complete letter to Boris (April 16, 878) will show how earnestly he set about his hopeless task. At your conversion, wrote[2] the Pope, we rejoiced, but now that you have been deceived into following the Greeks, we are sad; and we fear that "since they are wont to fall into different heresies and schisms, you also may fall with them into the depths of error."[3] This reflection it is which makes us anxious; "for we look not for glory, honour, or revenue from you. It is you and not

[1] Lapôtre, p. 71, citing the *Nova Tactica*, which was drawn up under Leo VI. the Wise (886–911), and which has been recently edited by Gelzer (*Georgii Cyp. Descrip. orbis Romani*, p. 57, Lipsiæ, 1890). *Cf.* also what was said by Photius, etc., in the second and fourth sessions of his council at Constantinople (879), as to readiness to arrange with the emperor about the surrender of rights over Bulgaria; and the actual surrender of those rights by Basil. This latter fact we learn from John's letter to him of August 13, 880. "Grates multas vobis referimus quia Bulgarorum diœcesim pro amore nostro gratanti animo S. Petro, ut justum erat, permiseritis habere." Ep. 246, p. 909.

[2] Ep. 108, p. 758.

[3] "Nam te, fili, rogo," he continues (*ib.*), "si aliquando Græci sine hac vel illa hæresi fuerint."

yours which we seek. We do not desire to govern your[1] state; but, in accordance with ancient custom, we wish to resume the spiritual care of those parts, in order that, of the solicitude which we owe to all the Churches, we may be able to bestow a special share on you." . . . Return then to Blessed Peter, whom you loved, whom you chose, whom you sought, whose help you have received in your necessities, and of the flood of whose teachings you have drunk. . . . We do not say that ours and theirs is not "the one faith, one Lord, one baptism" (Ephes. iv. 5), but we speak as we do, because amongst them,[2] through the patriarch (*præsul*) or emperor of Constantinople, or both, heresies often arise, and many of those who are their subjects, through flattery or fear, become like to them. Woe then to those who keep their company. . . . We believe, however, that it is well known to you that the Apostolic See has never been reproved (*reprehensam*) by other Sees, whereas it has very often reproved, freed from error, or, in cases of refusal to retract, judicially condemned all other Sees, and especially that of Constantinople." John warns them that, if they follow the Greeks, they may fare as did the Goths, who, from them, for Christianity received Arianism. Speaking then prophetically, he assures the king that if he turns to the Greeks he will inevitably share their fate. In conclusion, he thanks the king for the present he has sent him.

[1] *Ib.* "Nam non patriæ regimen et reipublicæ moderamen adipisci cupimus"—doubtless an allusion to the opposite disposition of the Greeks.

[2] "Non autem dicimus quod non una sit fides, unum baptisma unus Deus noster pariter et illorum, sed quia in eis sæpe, præsule Constantinopolitano, vel imperatore, aut plerumque utroque, auctore facto hæreseos, plures qui sub ipsis sunt adulatione aut certe timore, illis efficiuntur consimiles." *Ib.* Here we have an admirable summary of the ecclesiastical history of Constantinople.

John at the same time despatched other letters,[1] equally full of honourable feeling, to certain influential men of Bulgaria, who were exhorted to urge Boris to return to the bosom of the Roman Church. Letters[2] were also sent to the Greek clergy who had established themselves in Bulgaria, declaring them excommunicated, and, moreover, deprived of their dignities if they did not leave the country within thirty days. The same penalties were decreed[3] against Ignatius, who had been already twice warned by the Pope of what would befall him if he did not withdraw his clergy from the aforesaid country. Bishops Paul of Ancona and Eugenius of Ostia, the bearers of these letters and of others[4] to the emperor to the like effect, found on their arrival at Constantinople that Ignatius was long since dead (October 23, 877), and that Photius, reconciled to Basil, was patriarch in his stead.

John now continued more earnestly than ever his efforts to recall Boris to his duty. In May[5] 879, three letters were despatched to the king and to others, in which he excuses some bungling on the part of his ambassadors. The return of Branimir to the Roman obedience furnished the occasion for sending further letters[6] in June. In one[7] of them he reminded Boris of the gratitude he owed the Holy See on account of the civil and religious code (*totius religionis et justitiæ formam*) he had received from Pope Nicholas. Up to the end of his reign John continued[8] his appeals to the king. Yet, though he offered to do all he

[1] Epp. 109, 110. [2] Ep. 112. [3] Ep. 111. [4] Epp. 113, 114.

[5] 'May' apparently. These three letters, 217–9, in place of a date conclude with the formula "Data ut supra," a magic phrase of which no one has yet hit upon the exact meaning. Are they not the words of some official of the Roman chancellary, certifying that the letter was despatched in the form in which it appears above them?

[6] With Ep. 229 compare Ep. 231 of June 879, and Ep. 236.

[7] Ep. 236. [8] *Cf.* Epp. 308, 333, 369.

conscientiously could for him, he got nothing but words and presents. Boris had discovered that the patriarchs of Constantinople would 'go further' than the popes of Rome.

The little that remains to be said about Bulgaria and the popes till the thirteenth century may be as well mentioned here. Simeon (893–927), the younger son of Boris, who did so much for the spread of the Bulgarian power, but who could not hope for substantial concessions from the Byzantine empire with which he was often at war, reopened negotiations at Rome for an imperial crown and an independent patriarch of his own to crown him. He had the usual Bulgarian weakness; he would be the equal of the emperor at Constantinople. At any rate, while it is certain[1] that about the year 928 a papal embassy went to Bulgaria, it was *asserted*[2] in later times by a Bulgarian king, Calojan Jonitza, who restored the Bulgarian empire at the close of the twelfth century, and who asked similar favours of Innocent III., that the Pope had about that time sent a crown to be solemnly bestowed on the ruler of the Bulgarians.

In any case, however, the power of the Bulgarian monarchs and the privileges thus obtained did not last long. The Bulgarians in the East (971), whose capital was Presthlava, and afterwards (1019) those in the West, who

[1] Farlati, *Illyricum Sac.*, iii. 103, cited by Lapôtre, p. 89.

[2] *Cf.* the letters of Innocent III. of November 27, 1202 (1775 f., ap. Potthast, *Regest.*, p. 155). The Pope tells "Caloiohannis, lord of the B(v)laci and Bulgarians," that he is sending an envoy who "will inquire into the truth about the crown granted by the Roman Church to his predecessors, as well by old books as by other documents." Content with the evidence produced, another series of letters (February 25, 1204; 2135 f., ap. Potthast) shows that Innocent sent a crown, etc., to Calojan, bestowed the primacy on Basil, archbishop of Ternovo, and granted him the privilege of anointing and crowning the kings of the Bulgarians. *Cf.* Hurter, *Innocent III.*, i. 284, 563.

had fallen back upon Achrida, soon passed under the sway of Byzantium. They were subdued by the terrible Basil II., "the slayer of the Bulgarians"[1] (*Bulgaroctonus*).

It was during the century and a half of its subjection to Constantinople (1019–1186) that the final rupture between the popes and its patriarchs took place. As a conquered province, Bulgaria had, of course, to throw in its lot with the 'orthodox' Greeks. On the recovery of their freedom they renewed, as we have seen, intercourse with Rome. But they, or their rulers, have had but little thought except for their own personal ends. And up till to-day they have gone on playing off the Latins on the Greeks, and *vice versa*, for that object.

Photius in exile.

Inseparably connected with this early stage of the 'Bulgarian question,' as this narrative has already shown, was the notorious Photius, whom we left sent into exile by Basil.[2] Although at times depressed by his fall, Photius did not give way to despair. He turned his exceptional energy to letter writing, and took good care never to lose an opportunity. He realised the force of the proverb which he quoted[3] to Anastasius that "opportunity has long hair in front, by which it may be seized. But it is bald behind, and when once it has passed by, we cannot grasp it, do what we will." He also well understood how to improve an occasion. A master of the art of letter writing,[4] he wrote to everybody—to his friends, to his foes, and to those he wished to make his friends. And he wrote in every variety of style. He entreated, he bemoaned, he persuaded, he exhorted, he encouraged, and he cut and thrust too when he wanted to make an enemy respect him. "It has

[1] *Cf. The Empire and the Papacy*, Tout., p. 163 f., and map on p. 153.

[2] *Supra*, p. 191.

[3] Ep. 170, ed. Mont.

[4] Copious extracts from many of the letters which he wrote at this time are given by Jager, p. 237 f. *Cf.* Tosti, 273.

been said," he wrote[1] to one such, "that many have climbed up into the tree of tyranny; but no one has ever come down except with a crash. Why are you then so proud and haughty? With all your power and pride you are not at the top of the tree; you are only stupidly seated among the leaves and branches."

Photius recalled.

But he made no headway with Basil himself until he had the wit, so it is said, to draw up a genealogical tree, and to *prove* to Basil that he was, after all, of illustrious descent, and that he had come down in the direct line from Tiridates, king of Armenia![2]

His capability of forging documents stood Photius in good stead. He was recalled to court, and on the death of S. Ignatius (October 23, 877), was forthwith acknowledged[3] as patriarch by the emperor. Once again patriarch *de facto* if not *de jure*, Photius resumed his old methods to get himself acknowledged both at home and abroad. His faithful friends were rewarded, new ones were made by favours, and his enemies were won over or punished, some even unto death.[4] And again an effort was to be made to get the approval of Rome for his appointment.[5]

[1] Ep. 73, p. 122. *Cf.* another caustic letter he wrote to a monk who had abandoned his party. "That the most perfect have faults, the most vicious some virtue, is acknowledged by all; and proved by experience. Do not you spoil the truth of the axiom by showing yourself the only one without a virtue." Ep. 65, p. 118.

[2] Nicetas, *in vit. Ig.*, ap. Labbe, viii. 1251. Some, seemingly without sufficient reason, have called in question this part of the narrative of Nicetas. Hefele thinks the story has 'grown' out of Photius's having been asked to explain an obscure text. *Conc.*, vi. 11.

[3] Labbe, p. 1234. "Rursus patriarchæ thronum *per vim* invasit." *Cf.* p. 1254. "Non toto, quam Ignatius obierat, triduo elapso, tribunal patriarchale, revocata pristina et parricidali tyrannicaque mente, occupavit," etc. *Cf.* Stylian, *ib.*, p. 1402.

[4] "Multos pro veritate ad necem usque propugnantes sustulit." Nicetas, p. 1255.

[5] Because many declared that "they would not receive Photius, unless the Apostolic See of Rome confirmed him." Stylian, *ib.*

Basil writes to the Pope, 878.

In a letter now lost, Basil, without making any mention of the death of Ignatius, wrote to the Pope to ask him to send legates, whom he took good care to name, to heal the schism which was still unsubdued between Ignatius and the partisans of Photius—a schism which the emperor acknowledged had resulted in much violent usage of a great many clerics.

On receipt of this letter, John at once despatched two envoys to Constantinople, Paul, bishop of Ancona, and Eugenius of Ostia, with seven letters, all dated April 878. Of five of the letters, addressed to the Bulgarians and to Ignatius, whom the Pope supposed still alive, enough has been said already. In the letter[1] addressed to Basil, John praises him for his efforts in behalf of the peace of the Church of Constantinople. To second those efforts, he says, he is sending Paul and Eugenius, as those whom the emperor had asked for are otherwise engaged. "For we bear the burdens of all who are heavily laden, or rather who bears them in us is Blessed Peter, who protects and guards us the heirs in everything of his charge."

The Pope's legates.

It would seem that when John's legates arrived in Constantinople, they were treated by Photius as he had treated those of Nicholas. He so acted upon them by presents, threats, and deceptions, that he prevailed upon them to declare in a public gathering of clergy and laity that they had been sent to anathematise Ignatius and to proclaim Photius.[2] This sufficed to induce many to communicate with him.[3] But he felt that he could only obtain

[1] Ep. 113.

[2] Legatos "partimque donis (Photius) corrupit, partimque regiis minis perculsos impulit ut in conventu cleri . . . . et populi testarentur, se a P. Joanne adversus Ignatium missos, ut Ignatium anathemate ferirent, et Photium patriarcham renuntiarent." Stylian, ap. Labbe, viii. 1403.

[3] *Ib.*

general recognition by securing the approval of the Pope. He accordingly despatched to Rome one Theodore Santabarenus, a magician by repute, a man devoted to his interests, and as unscrupulous as himself in using any means whatsoever to accomplish an end. In a letter entrusted to Theodore, the Pope was assured that Photius had again taken possession of the Patriarchal See, but much against his will, and because compelled by clergy and people alike.[1] The emperor and the metropolitans, all, high and low,[2] were said to have expressed their opinion in writing that such was the best way to secure peace. In fine, John was asked to commission legates to represent him in a council to be held at Constantinople, and was assured that the emperor would send him that assistance of which he stood in so much need against the Saracens and his other enemies.

John approves of the restitution of Photius. 879.

The emperor's envoys, for whose safety[3] John took what precautions he could, reached Rome about May 879. Amazed at the unexpected turn that events in Constantinople had taken, John took time to consider what decision he ought to form. He held a synod,[4] at which seventeen bishops and seven cardinal priests and deacons assisted, and at which, after carefully weighing all the information that was to hand, five letters were drawn up, as well as a set of instructions (*commonitorium*) for the Pope's legates. These documents, dated August 16, 879, were, for the most part, afterwards shamefully mutilated in his own interests by Photius. Of this there is no doubt whatever; for, with regard to the letters, the authentic original Latin text still remains to be confronted with the

[1] Nicetas, *ib.*, p. 1258.

[2] According to Nicetas and Stylian (*ib.*), much fraud was practised by Photius in the matter of the letter from the metropolitans.

[3] Epp. 207, 211.

[4] *Cf.* the signatures of the bishops, etc., at the end of the *commonitorium*.

versions of such of them as Photius read before his council (November 879). The original Latin text of the *commonitorium* is no longer extant; but that it was tampered with is evident from a comparison between it and the authentic copies of the letters. The outcome of the deliberations of the synod was that, under the circumstances, the best thing would be to acknowledge Photius; and so, if possible, to avoid the schism which the Greeks seemed bent on causing. This was clearly stated in the following letter of the Pope to the emperor. The chief 'emendations' of this letter made by Photius will be given in the notes, so as not to confuse the real with the counterfeit.

John's letter to Basil.

John begins by praising the emperor for following in the footsteps of his "most pious predecessors" in paying reverence to the Holy See, and in submitting everything to its authority (*ejus cuncta subjicitis auctoritati*). That the "Roman See" is "the head of all the Churches of God is attested by the Fathers and by the laws of the orthodox emperors and the most reverent letters of Basil himself."[1] What, therefore, the emperor petitions for, "considering the needs of the time as much as anything" (*ratione seu temporis necessitate inspecta*), we have decided shall be done "by virtue of our apostolic power and with the knowledge and consent of the Apostolic See"[2] (the council noticed above). You have asked that the Apostolic See should show its mercy (*sede Ap. suæ pandente viscera pietatis*) and should acknowledge Photius as patriarch, lest

[1] This introduction would, of course, not suit Photius. He elaborates in his version the praise of the emperors; and, on the other, simply represents the emperor as turning to Rome "for the sake of union." The genuine letter of the Pope is to be found in Migne, Ep. 243 (p. 853), and the much longer interpolated specimen of the art or craft of Photius at the end of the former. The latter was the one read in the second session of the council of Photius.

[2] There is nothing like this in the 'edition' of Photius.

the Church of God, so long disturbed, should be allowed by us to remain divided. Consequently, now that we know that the patriarch Ignatius,[1] of blessed memory, is dead, we have decided, under the circumstances, to overlook (*ad veniam pertinere*) what has been decreed against Photius; and that, too, though without the consent of our See, he has usurped an office from which he had been interdicted. Accordingly, without going against the canons, or the Fathers; nay, rather following what they allow to be done in case of necessity, and having regard to the unanimous wish for his restoration on the part of the other patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and of all the bishops, even of those who were consecrated by Methodius and Ignatius, and for the peace and advantage of the Church of God, we acknowledge Photius as our fellow bishop, on "condition of his asking pardon before a synod"[2] (*misericordiam coram synodo secundum consuetudinem postulantem*—a condition on which John insists twice). Uniting, therefore, with the emperor in his desire for the peace of the Church, "we on whom rests the solicitude of all the churches, absolve[3] Photius and all the clerics and laity who were condemned with him from all ecclesiastical censures. This we do by virtue of that power (*illa potestate fulti*) which the Church throughout the whole world believes was given to us by Christ, our Lord, in the person of the prince of the Apostles, when He said

[1] Photius omits all about Ignatius and the "circumstances of the times," and makes out that the Pope had been *longing* to restore him, and that he had been restored, quite against his will, by the emperor.

[2] In his 'translation' Photius omits all mention of his having to ask pardon.

[3] This action is completely obliterated by Photius. But he makes up for it by inserting praises of himself, and making the Pope condemn the councils—the Eighth General Council included—which had condemned him.

to him: 'To thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven'" (S. Matt. xvi. 19).

All this the Pope does on the understanding (*eo tenore*) that after the death of Photius, some cardinal priest or deacon of the Church of Constantinople be elected patriarch —but not a layman or a member of the court; that inferior clerics be not promoted rapidly; and that Photius give up all pretensions to jurisdiction over Bulgaria.[1]

Bearing in mind that the emperors of Constantinople often treated their patriarchs merely by whim, the Pope goes on, greatly to his honour, to beg Basil to treat Photius with that respect which his position demands, and not to listen to what others may urge against him. He exhorts the emperor to treat with every consideration those who had been ordained by S. Ignatius in order that unity in the Church may be secured.

In conclusion, those who, after due warning, will not recognise Photius, are to be excommunicated; as is the patriarch[2] himself if he receives any bishops condemned by the Pope.

The Pope's letter to Photius.

John's letter[3] to Photius himself is to the same effect. The Pope refers the excessive praise given him by Photius to God. On the ground that *all* with one accord desire him; that he will ask pardon before a synod; and that no act of mercy towards one who repents is to be condemned, he acknowledges Photius for the sake of the peace of the

[1] These conditions are toned down by the Greek patriarch.

[2] This threat is omitted in the patriarch's version, which, on account of its insertions, etc., is half as long again as the real letter of John. A French translation of the whole of both these letters, as penned by the Pope and Photius respectively, as well as the original and the 'perversion' of John's letter to Photius himself, are given by Jager, p. 294 f.

[3] Ep. 248. Photius's *edition* follows it.

Church of Constantinople, on the same conditions with regard to Bulgaria, etc., that he laid down in his letter to the emperor. This letter, which concludes with a threat of excommunication if the patriarch does not do all in his power to restore the authority of the Pope in Bulgaria, was altered to suit his purposes by Photius in the same way in which he altered the letter to the emperor. Among other points may be noticed that praises which in the Pope's letter are given to God, Photius transfers to himself; and he makes John expressly condemn the Eighth General Council.

The instructions to the legates.

Unfortunately the instructions which John gave to his legates at Constantinople (to whom was now added the cardinal priest Peter, the bearer of all these letters) only exist in the form in which Photius presented them at the third session of his synod. That they also were tampered with will be clear to the reader, from the manner in which they contradict the Pope's real mind as set forth in his letters to Basil and to Photius. However, as the document is an interesting one, as showing the form in which the popes of the ninth century conveyed their wishes to their representatives abroad, we will give a synopsis of it. It was drawn up on the lines of the one sent by Pope Hormisdas to his legates at Constantinople in 515.

The legates are to live at Constantinople in the place assigned them by the emperor, and, till they see him, they are not to give the Pope's letters to any one. When they deliver them to the emperor they are to say to him that the Apostolic Pope, the lord John, his spiritual father, salutes him; and that in his daily prayers for him, he begs that God, who has implanted this desire for the peace of the Church in the breast of the emperor, may give him every good gift. If asked about their mission, they must refer the emperor to the letters; and if he further asks

about the letters themselves, they must tell him that they contain greetings and all directions as to what has to be done. Next day they must go and salute Photius, give him the Pope's letter to him, and address him becomingly to the effect that the Pope receives him as his colleague. Then, according to the version of the *commonitorium* that has come down to us, but quite in opposition to the real directions of the Pope, they are simply to require that Photius should appear before them in synod to be acknowledged by all. Then (doubtless as a means of softening the *opposition*, and at the same time of not offending his friends) the Pope is made to recommend that, of the bishops of the party of Ignatius who may become reconciled to Photius, those of them who had been consecrated *before* (*i.e.* by Ignatius before Photius had been intruded into his See, and of whom there would not be many) should keep their Sees; but that those among them who had been consecrated by Ignatius after his restoration (*deinde*) should simply receive support from the bishops in possession. The synod, over which the legates are to preside along with Photius [1] and the legates of the Orientals, is to be asked whether it receives the Pope's letters to the emperor. On its signifying its acceptance of them, it is to be told that the Pope, who has the care of all the Churches, has sent his legates to do all that is necessary for peace.

Finally the legates are to insist on civil functionaries not being in future elected to the See of Constantinople, to *ask* Photius not to tamper with Bulgaria, and to *declare null and void the synods under Hadrian, in Rome and Constantinople against Photius*. The legates are not to allow

[1] Here the very form of the sentence would seem enough to show that "along with Photius, etc.," is inserted: "Præsidentibus vobis in synodo *una cum* prædicto S. patriarcha et legatis Orientalibus, *una cum reliquis* archiepiscopis et metropolitis et omnibus sacerdotibus Constant."

themselves to be bribed or terrified, but must stand firm "as holding our place and power." Then come the signatures of the bishops who were present at the Roman synod, whence issued all these documents. The first runs: "I, Zachary, bishop of Anagni and librarian of the Apostolic See, have with my own hand signed this *commonitorium* for the reception of Photius, the most holy patriarch." There can be no doubt that the same hand which manipulated the preceding letters used the same methods of addition and subtraction with regard to these papal instructions also.

In the three[1] remaining letters put into the hands of Peter, the legates are told to perform this second mission better than the first; and Stylian and Metrophanes, and other opponents of Photius, were ordered to communicate with him, seeing that he has been restored for the sake of peace.

What is to be thought of this indulgence of John?

Here the narrative may be interrupted to consider the advisability of this indulgence of John towards Photius. It has been severely criticised by many Catholic writers; and the illustrious cardinal Baronius[2] goes so far as to ascribe the origin of the Pope Joan fable to what he calls this *feminine* weakness of John VIII. A fuller study of all the circumstances has, however, led many moderns to the conclusion that John's action was neither weak nor foolish. The wholesale abuse which was made of his clemency he could not foresee. And the state of affairs at the close of 879 was different from what it was under Nicholas and Hadrian. Now Ignatius was dead, so that

[1] Epp. 244, 5, 6.

[2] Tosti, though he will not praise John for restoring Photius, agrees (p. 274) that Baronius is too severe on the Pope, who throughout his ten years' reign had never any rest, being ever harassed by barbarians, worried by the Romans, betrayed by the emperor, and persecuted by princes.

Photius was no longer in the position of one who would hold what belonged to another.

No doubt, too, both the emperor and the Pope were thoroughly convinced that the only hope of bringing about unity in the Church of Constantinople was to restore Photius. When he had been expelled, and Ignatius restored by Basil, it was hoped that by degrees the partisans of Photius would be reconciled to Ignatius. But for some reason, these most reasonable expectations—the more reasonable when the pliability of the Greek hierarchy is considered—were doomed to disappointment. Photius was even able to boast[1] that not one of his partisans had abandoned his cause. Nicetas ascribes this to the *clemency* exercised by the Eighth General Council—a clemency which, he asserts, was due to the action of the Holy See—to which, "in compliance with ancient custom, the right of passing judgment was accorded."[2] Modern authors, however, with much greater reason, attribute this obstinate adhesion to the *severity* of that council. By not recognising the orders of the partisans of Photius, the council, as it were, burnt the boats by which the condemned might have returned to the Church. Further, there was much in the characters of Ignatius and Photius to account for the devotion of his followers to the latter. Severe to himself, Ignatius seems to have been somewhat severe towards the faults of others[3]; whereas Photius was not merely attractive

[1] Ep. 174, p. 245 f., ed. Mont.

[2] *In vit. Ig.*, p. 1235. "Romanis enim pro ecclesiastica antiqua traditione judicandi potestatem permittebat (Ignatius)." It were surely superfluous to point out that a stronger testimony from a Greek of the primacy of *jurisdiction* of the Holy See could not be desired. The most devoted admirer of Ignatius, he unequivocally states that Ignatius had no authority to do as he wished: ὅτι μὴ ἀυθεντικὸν εἶχε τὸν ὃ βουλετο δρᾶν· μᾶλλον δὲ τοῖς Ρωμαίοις, κατὰ τὴν ἀνωθεν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν, τὴν τῆς κρίσεως ἐξουσίαν παρεχωρει.

[3] Nicetas, *ib.*

by his genius, but was prepared to go all lengths—and his talents enabled him to go far—in accommodating his conscience as well to the desires of his own heart as to those of his followers. It is possible, too, that John was at least partly deceived as to the real state of things in Constantinople, particularly in the matter of the alleged unanimity of desire on the part of clergy and laity alike for the restoration of Photius.

Finally, though there is no valid reason to doubt that the Pope's first motive in restoring Photius was to heal the dissensions in the Church of Constantinople, and to stave off as long as possible the inevitable schism between the East and the West, it may well be granted that the hope of saving Bulgaria from schism and of getting help from the emperor against the Saracens also influenced him in acceding to the desires of Photius. For in this year, 879, dire were the difficulties[1] of the Pope. Harassed on the one side by the Duke of Spoleto, and on the other by the Saracens, with no ruler in the West able or willing to take the imperial crown, John found that while the new empire of the West was rushing to ruin, the old empire of the East was, under Basil, renewing its youth. No wonder the Pope was inclined to be as accommodating as possible in cultivating the friendship of Basil. And when once he had made up his mind on a certain line of action to be pursued, he acted with vigour. If he was anything, he was thorough. All his letters, those on the subject of the

[1] *Cf.* his letter of this year (Ep. 200) to Anspert of Milan. "Quantæ necessitatis assidue sustinuerimus incommoda, quantæque perturbationis nunc usque passi sumus, et quotidie patiamur adversa, fraternitatem vestram nosse luce clarius non ignoramus." Two years before he had told the same archbishop (Ep. 61) that "the dangers of these times" compelled him to a wholesale use of dispensation. "Moderatio sedis ap., universalis Ecclesiæ dispositio, in hoc periculoso tempore pene cuncta dispensatorie moderanda compellit."

restoration of Photius included, show anything but weakness. Hence the decided tone of his letter to Metrophanes and Stylian and to the other firm and faithful adherents of Ignatius. No sooner had he determined that the acknowledging of Photius was the best thing for peace, than he resolved that friend and foe alike must be made to fall into line. And certainly that was the only consistent policy.

'Council' of Photius, 879.

On the arrival (November 879) of the cardinal-priest Peter at Constantinople, Photius at once assembled a council. As the acts of this synod embody not only the Pope's letters, tampered with as just shown, but other matters, for different reasons difficult of explanation, some authors have expressed their belief that no council was held by Photius at all, and that what purports to be its 'acts' is but another forgery on the part of that false Greek. However, the general opinion now is that a council was held, but that its acts contain much that cannot be relied on. In reading them, distrust is instinctively aroused. If, for instance, the Pope's legates acted and spoke as the acts would have us believe, they must have betrayed their cause even more absolutely than any other papal envoys in Constantinople had ever done before them. However, as it is certain that they were largely ignorant of Greek—the proceedings of the second session show that Peter needed an interpreter—it is more natural to suppose either that their discourses have been wrongly interpreted, or that the words of others were falsely rendered to them, or both.

The council was opened in November; and, according to the acts, was presided over by Photius, and was attended by no less than 383 bishops. Of these bishops who were all from the patriarchate of Constantinople, some had already taken part in the Eighth General Council, and others represented Sees which have never been heard of in any

other connection than with this council.[1] With regard to the Oriental Sees, in the first session held[2] in the great sacristy in the Church of St. Sophia, only the See of Jerusalem was supposed to be represented. But by the fourth, the other two Sees of Alexandria and Antioch were equally supposed to be represented. *Supposed*, because it is extremely doubtful whether Cosmas and the other professed envoys of the Oriental Sees were really their properly accredited legates.[3]

Though Photius on several occasions in the course of the synod spoke in very flattering terms of John himself, even calling him his 'spiritual father,'[4] and though at the end of the first of the three canons promulgated in the fifth session there was a declaration to the effect that there was no intention of introducing any innovations with regard to the privileges of the Holy See,[5] the Pope was throughout the council—even in this very canon—spoken of as though he were nothing more than patriarch of the West, and as though, consequently, he had no rights over any other part of the Church and was in no way superior to Photius himself. Indeed, in the fifth session, Basil, metropolitan of Martyropolis, who was set down as the representative of the See of Antioch, openly declared that, as Photius was the highest bishop (*ἀρχιερεὺς μεγιστος*), he held the primacy by the will of God. And this, too, if the acts are to be

[1] Hefele, vi. 35.

[2] Most of the sessions were held in the Church itself. The acts of this council will be found in Mansi or Harduin, but not in Labbe. A full abstract of them in Hefele, vol. vi., Fr. ed.; Jager, p. 320 f.; Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. 53.

[3] Hergenröther, iii. 421.

[4] *Cf.* first session—Mansi, *Conc.*, xvii. pp. 379, 382.

[5] "Μηδὲν τῶν προσόντων πρεσβείων τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ Θρόνῳ τῆς Ῥωμαίων Ἐκκλησίας, μηδὲ τῷ ταύτης προέδρῳ, τὸ σύνολον καινοτομουμένων, μηδὲ νυν, μηδὲ εἰς τὸ μετοπειτα" (Canon I.). The tenth canon (p. 471) rejected the Eighth General Council of 869.

trusted, without a word of protest not merely from any other bishop, but from the Pope's legates. These latter may, indeed, have been wholly ignorant of what was really being said.

The 'acts,' as we now have them, are simply one hymn of praise in honour of Photius. Even the papal legate Eugenius is, in the first session, made almost blasphemously to assert: "The soul of the Pope was so intimately united to that of Photius as to form, as it were, but one soul with it; and just as he *desired to be united with God*, so he *desired to become one with Photius*." Who can resist the feeling, on reading such things as this in the acts, that he is not dealing with facts but with the exuberances of fancy? Such language Photius might wish to have been used by others, but surely it cannot be that they proceeded from any other brain than his own.

In the second, third, and fourth sessions the Bulgarian question came up for consideration. While Photius and the synod professed to be ready to fall in with the Pope's wishes in this matter, they asserted that the marking out of boundaries was a matter for the emperor[1] to deal with. However, in the fourth session, they promised to use their influence with the emperor to get the Pope's requirements on this subject complied with. In the fifth session, which began on January 26, 880, the council was largely concerned with vainly endeavouring to bring over to its views Metrophanes of Smyrna, the faithful friend of Ignatius. With the signing of the acts, at the close of this session, the synod was, properly speaking, over. But in the acts two more sessions are reported as having taken place. They were held in the imperial palace, and at the first of them the emperor presided. Besides the papal legates and Photius, only the Oriental vicars and eighteen metropolitans

[1] Mansi, *ib.*, p. 455.

were present. To strengthen the foundation for the defence of his doctrine on the "Descent of the Holy Ghost," Photius procured the signatures of all to a formula containing the Nicene Creed without the addition of the 'Filioque,' and anathemas against such as should add to this symbol words imagined by themselves.

On the 13th of March (880) was held the seventh and last session of the council. The formula of faith propounded at the previous private sitting was proposed to this public session, and, of course, accepted. Nor was this last session brought to a close without another pronouncement that Photius "had the spiritual priority over the whole Church."

Before parting company with the *Acts of the Council of Photius*, "si l'on peut y ajoûter foi, sçachant combien il était habile et hardi faussaire,"[1] a letter[2] purporting to be from the Pope to Photius, and which is appended to the acts, must be noticed. In this document John declares that he condemns those who have dared to add the 'Filioque' to the Creed, "as transgressors of the divine word, and overthrowers of the theology of Christ."[3] There is no need to give here the arguments, intrinsic and extrinsic, which demonstrate the apocryphal character of this letter, as even Bower concludes[4] "the letter in question to be forged."

Loaded with presents for themselves, and with presents and letters from Photius both to the Pope and to various bishops,[5] and with a letter from the emperor to the Pope, The Papal legates return to Rome, Aug. 880.

[1] Thus speaks even Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.*, t. 53, n. 24.

[2] Ap. Migne, Ep. 350. It bears no date.

[3] "*Reverentiæ tuæ* iterum significamus, ut de hac additione in Symbolo (ex Filio scilicet) *tibi satisfaciamus*, quod non solum hoc non dicimus, sed etiam quod eos, qui principio hoc dicere sua insania ausi sunt, quasi transgressores divini verbi condemnamus, etc." *Ib.*

[4] *Lives of the Popes*, v. 78.

[5] In the later editions of the letters of Photius, letters to Zachary of Anagni, Marinus of Cervetri, and Gauderic of Velletri, are to be found.

the papal legates returned to Rome, which they reached about August. Unfortunately the letters of Photius and the emperor to John are lost; but the replies of the Pope to them, sent off before the acts of the council could be translated, are still extant. In his letter[1] to Basil (August 13, 880), he praises and thanks him for his efforts in behalf of the peace of the Church, and for his acting in concert "with the merciful authority and decisions of the Apostolic See, which, through the will of Christ, holds the primacy of the whole Church."[2] The interest the emperor takes in "the Church of St Peter and our paternity," he has proved by deeds as well as words. Hence John goes on to thank him first for the men-of-war[3] he had sent to protect the territory of St Peter; then for restoring to the jurisdiction of the Holy See the monastery of St Sergius in Constantinople; and lastly, for allowing us to have "the diocese of the Bulgarians." The Pope concludes with these words: "What has been mercifully (*misericorditer*) decreed in synod at Constantinople as to the restitution of Photius, we accept. But if, perchance, in this synod our legates have acted against our apostolic instructions, then we do not accept what has been thus done, nor do we regard it as having any force at all."[4] The Pope's letter[5] to Photius is more uncompromising still. He commences by saying that his one aim has ever been to

[1] Ep. 296, p. 909.

[2] The reader cannot fail to notice the different ring about the genuine letters of John. The primacy of the Roman See is asserted plainly, and John makes it evident that the restoration of Photius is the outcome of his merciful indulgence.

[3] "Primo quidem quod dromones vestros, qui pro defensione terræ S. Petri in nostro manerent servitio, nobis misistis." *Ib.*

[4] "Et si fortasse legati in eadem synodo contra apost. præceptionem egerint, nos nec recipimus nec judicamus alicujus existere firmitatis." *Ib.*

[5] Ep. 297, p. 910.

promote the peace of the Church. Hence, wishing to have pity on the Church of Constantinople, he had willed that the elevation of one man should not prove the loss of another, but rather be to the profit of all. And so, while he rejoices at the unity now to be found in the Church of Constantinople, he feels bound to say that he is astonished that many of his instructions have not been duly carried out —by whose fault he knows not—and this, too, when he had decided[1] that through mercy special treatment was to be granted to him (Photius). He will not listen to the excuse that forgiveness is only to be asked by those who have done wrong. "Let not your prudence, which is said to be acquainted with humility, be angry that it has been ordered (*jussa est*) to ask pardon of the Church of God, but rather let your prudence learn to humble itself that it may be exalted." The Pope concludes this letter in the very same words as the preceding. He receives Photius, but not what his legates may have done against his injunctions.

What further steps were taken by John in connection with this assembly,[2] which the Greeks to this day speak of as the Eighth General Council instead of the one in 869, are by no means clear. However, from the letter[3] of Stephen (V.) VI. to Basil, it is regarded as certain that John

[1] "Cum nos scriptis et verbis *misericorditer* tecum *specialiter* agendum esse decrevimus." *Ib.*

[2] As the name of Doellinger has great weight with many, his estimate of the Council of Photius may be usefully cited: "This synod might be viewed in all its parts as a worthy sister of the Council of Robbers of the year 449, with this difference, that in the earlier synod violence and tyranny, in the later, artifice, fraud, and falsehood, were employed by wicked men to work out their wicked designs. Photius had, on many preceding occasions, given such proofs of his mastery in the art of falsification that it is more than probable . . . . that many things in the acts of this synod were forged or interpolated by him." *Hist. of the Church*, iii. 100, Eng. trans.

[3] Labbe, viii. 1391 f.

despatched on a new embassy to Constantinople Marinus, who had distinguished himself as a deacon at the Eighth General Council and was now bishop of Cervetri, the ancient Cære in Etruria. Finding that Marinus was made of different metal from the other legates of John, and that he could neither be hoodwinked nor bribed, Basil tried to frighten him. Marinus was thrown into prison, but he could not be won over.

On the return of his legate to Rome in the beginning of 881, John apparently solemnly condemned Photius. This would seem to be proved, first by the way in which his legate Marinus had been treated for carrying out the Pope's instructions, and then by the testimony of the Greek abridgment of the acts of the Eighth General Council of 869. This authority positively states that John condemned Photius, who had "deceived and corrupted" the legates Eugenius, etc. Gospel in hand, he is said to have mounted the pulpit, and to have declared that whoever should not regard Photius as condemned by the just judgment of God should be anathema.[1]

It is further certain that there is no more mention of Photius in the letters of John.[2] If it be argued against what has been said, that Photius would not have continued to speak of John in terms of praise as he did,[3] if that Pope also had excommunicated him, it may be replied that it doubtless suited Photius to have it believed that John's recognition of him was never withdrawn.

[1] "Joannes accepto evangelio ambonem conscendit, cunctisque audientibus dixit: Quicumque Photium non justo Dei judicio condemnatum judicat . . . . anathema sit." Ap. Labbe, *ib.*, p. 1422. *Cf.* the epitome of the Eighth General Council, which was affixed to the entrance of the Church of St. Sophia, and which mentions 'John' as one of the nine popes who condemned Photius, and his public condemnation of his legates. *Ib.*, p. 1423.

[2] Lapôtre, p. 68.

[3] In his *De Spir. S. mystagogia*, written perhaps later than 896.

The condemnation of Photius, pronounced by John, was renewed by his immediate successors, Marinus, Hadrian III., Stephen (V.) VI., and Formosus,[1] who became Pope the same year in which it is believed by most authors[2] that Photius died (February 6, 891). The details of their proceedings against him will be found in the biography of Stephen VI.

John and Louis II.

Whilst John was occupied with these important events in the East, he was busy with others of no less importance, though of a more political character, in the West. But if his skill in politics has evoked the praises not only of his contemporaries but of modern writers of every shade of opinion, some of the latter would make out that he devoted his abilities in that direction to raising to a greater height the fabric of the temporal power of the Roman See on the ruins of the empire—ruins which he himself helped to cause. A careful examination of the Pope's actions, however, reveals the fact that he did all he could to strengthen the empire. If the empire of Charlemagne went still further to pieces during his pontificate, it was not owing to any imaginary humiliation inflicted on it by the Pope. It was due to the only too natural want of a series of rulers like Charlemagne. Only by a succession of such master-minds could the numerous and powerful obstacles to the imperial unity of the West have been overcome—obstacles, not only from without, caused by the incessant inroads of barbarians, but also from within, in the shape of physical barriers, linguistic differences, and racial enmities. The glorious unity, laboriously erected after hundreds of years of toil by the genius of Rome, had been so shattered, especially

[1] The inscription affixed to the right-hand portico of St. Sophia, cited above, gives the names of the nine popes, from Leo IV. to Formosus inclusive, who condemned Photius. Ap. Labbe, viii. 1423.

[2] Of course if, as Lapôtre believes (p. 69 n.), Photius composed his *Mystagogia* after the year 896, he must also have died after that date.

in the fifth century by Hun and Goth, that apparently its fragments could not be welded together again. With his keen political insight John realised clearly enough that it would require all that emperor and Pope could effect, working in the fullest harmony, to stem the tide of anarchy which was setting in strongly, in Italy especially. And nobly did he strain every nerve to try to stop it. But "neither the diplomatic genius of John the Eighth, nor the abilities of any other Pope were capable of overcoming the chaos which prevailed in Italy. The bishops of Lombardy, the feudal dukes, who had all risen to power with the fall of the empire, the princes of southern Italy, the Saracens, the German kings, the rebellious Roman nobles, had all to be overcome at one and the same time, and the task of the subjugation of so many hostile forces proved beyond the powers of one solitary man."[1] But without feeling, indeed, must he be who can see the heroic old Pope battling with every form of evil till he has to cry out that the misery of the people entrusted to him is so great that the tomb is the only comfort left for him[1]—and who can then withhold from him his admiration.

John supports Louis.

John began his efforts in behalf of the well-being of Italy by giving his hearty support to the emperor Louis. He loved Italy, and therefore did all he could for Louis, whom he properly regarded as its only hope.[2] In the first months of his pontificate he wrote[3] to Charles the Bald. And, as he avers in his letter, following in the footsteps of his spiritual father Hadrian, from whom he had inherited the overlordship of the Church (*principatum ecclesiæ*) and the power of punishing the disobedient, he exhorted the king to give up to the emperor the kingdom of Lothaire.

[1] Gregorovius, iii. p. 204.

[2] "Cum pro populi nobis commissi vastatione solum nobis superuit sepulcrum." Ep. 57, p. 710.

[3] Ep. 47, ap. Loewenfeld. *Cf. supra*, p. 179 ff.

If he fails to do this, the Pope "'will come himself with a rod,' as his 'spirit of meekness' has been set at naught" (1 Cor. iv. 21). We have already[1] seen how, to save the honour of Louis, John lent himself to his policy in the matter of the reconciliation between him and the duke of Beneventum. In every way,[2] too, did he second the efforts of the emperor in his endeavours to break up the Saracen power in south Italy. And when the tyrannical Sergius, duke of Naples, of whose treatment of his uncle mention has been made, and of whom we shall hear again, thought himself powerful enough to despise emperor and Pope alike, and, following the example of Michael the Drunkard, even went to the length of treating an embassy of the Pope with contempt, John wrote[3] to Louis that he would strike Sergius, if not with a sword of steel, like that with which Michael had been slain, at least with a spiritual sword. He will excommunicate him at once in council, and will inform the patriarch of Constantinople and the other patriarchs of his impious cruelty, so that he may be condemned by the whole Church as he has been by the Church of Rome.

Hence, despite some minor differences between them, John could write[4] in all confidence to the widowed Engelberga that he had ever had the greatest affection for Louis, and that he would never cease to pray for him daily.

John was as true to Engelberga as to her husband. He always watched over her interests, as many of his letters

[1] *Supra*, p. 189. *Cf.* Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 873.

[2] Details *infra*.

[3] Ep. 56, Loewen. That the person condemned in this letter was Sergius II., duke of Naples, is shown by Lapôtre, p. 229. What he says there, a comparison between Ep. 28 (Migne) and this one would serve to strengthen. Special reference is made to the patriarch of Constantinople, because Naples was supposed to be subject to the Byzantine empire.

[4] Ep. 105.

to her show. We will cite a beautiful extract from his letter to her of March 877. He begins by assuring her that his sentiments towards her have not undergone any change, for love knows not change. He writes to her in order that she may not give way under her troubles; for the apostle has taught us "that tribulation worketh patience; and patience trial; and trial hope. And hope confoundeth not" (Ros. v. 3); "The things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. iv. 18). "Have ever, therefore, before your eyes the saints who through patience have shone like stars in the world; and so walk with sinless feet to your heavenly home, in which they shall dwell who, guided by the words of our Lord, possess their souls in patience (St. Luke xxi. 19). For hostile death has taken nothing away, which the life, which is Christ, has not changed to what is better. Death has deprived you of a mortal husband, but the latter (Christ) has given you in Himself an undying spouse. You who were called the wife of an earthly spouse, may now with greater honour be said to be the bride of a heavenly one. A corruptible crown has been taken from you, an incorruptible one is being made ready for you. Insignia which fade have been removed from you, but there have been stored up for you ornaments which grow not old. What further? For a kingdom full of cares and phantoms, you will receive one truly real and happy. Truly this is a change of the right hand of the Most High. But, as a word or two is enough for a wise man, you will find these few words enough for you, who know well how to draw many thoughts from a few sentences."[1]

Charles the Bald, emperor, 875.

On the death of Louis II. (August 12, 875), the last of the Carolingians who bore with anything like credit the title of emperor, both of his uncles, Charles the Bald and

[1] Ep. 66. *Cf.* Balan, p. 14.

Louis the German, were anxious to succeed to his kingdom and to the proud name of emperor; for Louis had only left behind him a daughter, Hermengard. When they assembled at Pavia, the Italian nobles, chief among whom at this time were Berenger of Friuli, Lambert of Spoleto, and Adalbert I. of Tuscany, played a double game. Unknown to either of the candidates, they invited to the throne of Italy *both* Charles the Bald and Louis the German.[1] Whilst they were acting in this diplomatic or rather cunning manner, John sent to Charles the Bald an embassy,[2] in which figured Formosus of Porto, to express to him the goodwill of the Romans for him, and his own wish "that his excellency might be elected for the honour and exaltation of the Holy Roman Church, and for the security of Christian people."[3] Charles waited for no more, and by the quickness of his movements disconcerted his rival. The two sons of Louis the German, Carloman and Charles the Fat, who had entered Italy to support their father's claims by force of arms, found themselves compelled to leave the country. Whereas Charles the Bald, the chosen candidate of the Pope, successfully made

[1] *Cf.* c. 19 (ap. *Script. Rer. Lang.*) of the *Hist.* of Andrew of Bergamo, an author as accurate in his *facts* as barbarous in his style, who began to write in 877. He was present at the funeral of Louis II. According to the *Libellus de imp. pot.*, it was the wish of the late emperor that Carloman, the son of Louis the German, should succeed him.

[2] *Cf.* the *Capit. ab Odone propos.*, among the acts of the Council of Pontion (ap. Mansi, *Concil.*, xvii., Append.; Hefele, vi. p. 94), a synod assembled, "vocatione D. Johannis . . . . et jussione D. Karoli" (ed. Boretius, ii. 351), and Odoranni *Chron.*, an. 874, ap. *P. L.*, t. 142. "D. Joannes . . . . per Jadericum Veliternensem, etc. . . . . D. Carolum . . . . ad limina SS. App. invitavit, eumque Ecclesiæ ipsius *defensorem* auctoremque elegit."

[3] "Excellentiam tuam ad honorem et exaltationem S. Rom. ecclesiæ, et ad securitatem populi Christiani eligendam esse speravimus." Deusdedit, *Collect. Can.*, iv. 104, p. 419; Jaffé, 3019.

his way to Rome, and received the imperial crown on Christmas Day[1] (875).

Duchesne on John's choice.

On the action of Pope John in his choice of Charles the Bald, Mgr. Duchesne, who ordinarily seems rather disposed to belittle the part played by the popes before this period in bestowing the imperial crown, makes this comment in one of his latest works—*Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical*: "There is here no longer question (as in 816, 823, and in 850) of a mere ceremony of consecration, nor even, as in 800, of an outward initiative, more or less obvious, but of a real determining choice. How the situation is changed indeed! From the year 824, the popes, in principle and generally in fact, were confirmed by the emperor. Now the emperor is chosen by the Pope. And John was destined to have the opportunity of making such a choice no less than twice in the ten years of his pontificate."[2]

Why preferred by John.

If we are to believe the German annals of Fulda and Regino, equally likely with the author of the annals to favour his ruler, Charles the Bald, who according to them was a worthless coward, bought the imperial crown from John and the Romans. But against this, it is certain that both Nicholas I. and Hadrian II. had already looked forward to Charles's being emperor.[3] Moreover John himself

[1] Hincmar, *Annal.*, ad an. 875. "Carolus, pluribus (de primoribus ex Italia) receptis, Romam, invitante P. Johanne perrexit." . . . . Then, ad an. 876, "In die nativitatis Domini, B. Petro multa et pretiosa munera offerens, in imperatorem unctus et coronatus, atque Romanorum imperator appellatus est."

[2] Pg. 135.

[3] In addition to the letter of Hadrian to Charles, already cited, we have the assurance of John to the bishops of Louis's kingdom: "Hunc (Carolum) a decessoribus nostris, reverendæ scilicet memoriæ *Nicolao* et Adriano pontificibus, diu quidem desiderari voluit (Deus omnipotens). Ep. 22, a letter read at the Synod of Pontion. *Cf.* John's discourse to the Council of Ravenna in 877, and the author of the *Libellus de imp. potest.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 966.

had, on the death of Louis, at once declared his preference for him, both because he was the most fit to bear the responsibilities of the empire, and because he himself wished to carry on the policy of his predecessors. No doubt Charles the Bald was not equal to the emergencies of the times; but he was the best of those from whom the Pope had to select, and was anything but the coward the annals of Fulda would make out.[1] Not only had John a genuine admiration for Charles—an admiration which he expressed even after his death, when he could not hope for anything for him—but his predecessors, Nicholas I. and Hadrian II., had also expressed their regard for Charles in their letters to him. Even such a judge of character as the librarian Anastasius[2] was free with his praises of the king of the West Franks. In fine, Charles's love for and patronage of learning would weigh with Rome. Indeed, the imperial pamphleteer, who wrote about 897, as Lapôtre has proved in a masterly manner, expressly asserts that the 'Roman pontiffs' invited Charles to come for the imperial crown "because he was a sort of philosopher."[3] There is not, then, the slightest reason for supposing that John fixed upon Charles the Bald to wear the imperial crown for any other fundamental motive than that he was the most suitable candidate under the circumstances. The bribes spoken of by the German annals were no more than the customary presents. Nor can it be said that Charles paid for the title by giving up any of the rights which had been claimed by his predecessors since the agreement of 824. It was

[1] This is proved irrefragably by Lapôtre, p. 266 f.

[2] *Cf.* his letters to Charles the Bald, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 737 f.

[3] "Et quia erat in litteris quasi philosophus, rogabant (Romani pontifices) illum (Carolum) supervenire B. Petro, et de servitutis jugo ad propriam libertatem reducere suam ecclesiam." *Libel. de imp. potest.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 966; or *ib.*, t. 139, p. 55. Hence Lupus of Ferrières (Ep. 119) speaks of Charles as "doctrinæ studiosissimus."

not,[1] as we shall see, till the latter half of 876 that any important concessions were made by Charles to the requests of the Pope. Whilst he was in Rome, John made no effort to induce him to abolish those rights with regard to administration of justice within the pontifical states which were claimed by the emperors in virtue of the constitution of 824, or to carry out in full the donation of Charlemagne.

The assembly at Pavia, Feb. 876.

Dread of Louis the German prevented the new emperor from remaining long in Rome after his coronation. The month of February found him at Pavia, receiving, at a diet he held there, oaths of obedience from the Italian prelates and nobles who confirmed the choice made by God through the Vicar of the Apostles.[2] A capitulary was published by Charles with the consent of the bishops and nobles of the kingdom of Italy, "for the peace and advantage of the whole empire." It opens by declaring that, "as the Roman Church is the head of all Churches, it must be honoured and revered by all. Its rights must not be molested, so that it may be able to extend its pastoral care to the universal Church." Mindful of what had been done for him by the Pope, Charles next (c. 2) lays down that "honour must be paid by all to our lord and spiritual father John, supreme pontiff and universal Pope; and that what he decrees in the order of his sacred ministry by apostolic authority must be observed by all with the greatest reverence." Especially are the territory and property of the Apostles to be respected. The bishops and the emperor are to be honoured; and the former are to do

[1] *Cf.* Lapôtre, p. 249 f. For deeds of the Pope in harmony with the concordat of 824, *ib.*, p. 231 f.

[2] "Divina pietas vos . . . . per vicarium . . . . D. Johannem summum pontificem . . . . ad imperiale culmen provexit; nos unanimiter vos protectorem nostrum et Italici regni regem eligimus." *Capit. reg. Franc.*, ii. 99, ed. Boretius. But see *infra*, p. 285 and p. 292 ff.

their duty without being hindered. While most of the items of this capitulary concern the conduct of bishops, the last one forbids anyone to harbour any of the enemies of the emperor.[1]

John goes to Naples 876.

On the departure (January 5) of Charles for Pavia, whither, as we have seen, he went to receive the submission of the great nobles of Italy and to settle the details of its government, John, no doubt in consequence of an understanding with him, set out for Naples.[2] He went in company with Guy and his brother Lambert, duke of Spoleto, who had been commissioned by Charles to help the Pope.[3] The object of his journey was to break up the disgraceful league which in 874 the southern states and cities had formed with the infidel Moslems. Of all the troubles which John had to encounter, this 'Saracen alliance' gave him the greatest pain. No thorn pierced him more deeply. Still, though it was clear that the infidels were about to renew their aggressions in force, he was able to effect but little. So self-seeking were the small states and the independent cities of the coast, that not only Sergius, duke of Naples, and Adelgisus of Benevento, but even Lambert of Spoleto, refused to give up the Saracen alliance. Only Guaifer[4] of Salerno, Landulf, bishop and count of Capua, and the city of Amalfi hearkened to the Pope's entreaties. Besides the failure of his efforts to bring the southern states to a sense of their duty as Christians—not to say as Italians—John had other weighty matters to trouble him at this time. The attitude of Louis the German towards Charles had caused him anxiety for some months past; and, when he returned to Rome

[1] *Ib.*, 100 f.

[2] Lapôtre, p. 304 n., establishes that this journey was made after February 17 and before March 31, 876.

[3] Erchempert, c. 39; *Epp.*, 28, 31.

[4] Erchemp., *ib.* *Cf. infra.*

at the end of March, he had to face great difficulties brought about by some of the most important men in the city.

Louis the German opposes Charles.

As the feeling of jealous hostility to Charles on the part of his brother, Louis the German, had been sufficiently evinced by his sending his sons to try to prevent his march to Rome, John wrote[1] to him, before Charles arrived there, to exhort him not to invade the latter's territories. But of these letters Louis took no heed. He crossed the frontier (875) and ravaged the country in all directions. Charles could not, under those circumstances, stop long in Italy. By the beginning of March (876) he was *en route* for France, accompanied by two papal legates, who were the bearers of several letters[2] from John, and had been sent to promote peace. In these letters, addressed to the nobility of both kingdoms, those of Charles's kingdom who remained true to him were praised, those who had gone over to Louis blamed and exhorted to penance. The bishops and counts of the kingdom of Louis are reprehended for not preventing their sovereign from invading the territories of his absent brother, and told to make satisfaction to the Pope's legates. And strong is the language in which John denounces that king himself, "if king (*rex*) he deserves to be called, who has not controlled (*rexit*) his unruly passions";[3] that prince "who, while the fields[4] of Fontenay are still soaking with the blood which he had shed there in his youth, in his old age hastens to shed the blood of innumerable Christians to gratify his lust for power." But, despite of enemies of all kinds, the Pope

[1] Of these letters, now lost, we have knowledge from the second of the *Capitula ab Odone propos.*, at the Council of Pontion. John sent the letters "monentes eos (Louis and his nobles, clerical and lay) apostolica auctoritate more paterno servare, quæ pacis sunt." *Capit.*, ed. Bor., ii. 351.

[2] Epp. 20–23. [3] Ep. 21 [4] Ep. 22.

continued, everything has worked out well for Charles. For God "has permitted him to march through Italy, not only without shedding of blood, but with great honour and to the general joy of all the people; and, by the favour of the Apostolic See, and with the approval of all, has raised him to the imperial throne."[1]

Condemnation of Formosus and others, 867.

But there were at this time also troubles nearer home in store for John. On his return to Rome towards the end of March, he had to take action regarding Formosus of Porto and several of the chief officials of his court. Whether he had not felt himself strong enough to remove them before, especially while the Emperor Louis II. was alive, or because the cup of their iniquities was not full, he had left in the positions in which he found them, Gregory the nomenclator, and 'apocrisiarius[2] of the Holy See,' George of the Aventine and Sergius, 'masters of the soldiers.' With these men, whose lives are samples of the increasing lawlessness and licentiousness of the Roman nobility which is soon to cause such degradation to Rome and the Papacy, Formosus was in some way[3] connected. We are unfortunately very much in the dark in connection with the condemnation of these men by John VIII. However, from the account of the sentence passed on

[1] *Ib.* "Non solum sine sanguine, verum etiam cum magnis honoribus, hinc inde gaudentibus populis, Italiam penetrare permisit, et per apost. sedis privilegium, cunctorum favoribus approbatum sceptris imperialibus sublimavit."

[2] That functionary was a sort of minister of foreign affairs. It does not appear that this office had any lengthy existence, at least under this title. It was probably much the same as the old office of 'primicerius.' Indeed, Gregory is called primicerius also in the acts of his condemnation.

[3] According to his panegyrist Auxilius (*In def. S. ordin. Formosi*), Formosus was regarded by John with suspicion because he was a friend of George, etc. Terrified at the rumours as to what was going to be done to them, all had fled in fear. C. 3 ap. Dümmler, *Aux. und Vulg.*, p. 63.

them by him, which he sent to "all the people of Gaul and Germany,"[1] it appears that Gregory had done nothing else, for the eight years during which he had held office, but enrich himself by plundering everybody and everything within his reach; and, when he had had to fly the city, had taken with him "almost all the treasure of the Roman Church." As bad as Gregory was his brother, the secundicerius Stephen; and worse than he was his son-in-law, George of the Aventine. After poisoning his brother for the sake of his mistress, whom he desired for himself, he repaired his fortunes, ruined doubtless by his luxurious life, by wedding the niece of Benedict III. And then, to become the son-in-law of the apocrisiarius, he murdered almost in public (*pene publice*), writes the Pope, his lawful wife, to whom, needless to add, he had been unfaithful. He escaped the consequences of this crime through perjured imperial *missi*, and, of course, through the connivance of his new father-in-law, Gregory. Of the same clique, and as deep in crime, was Sergius. Like George, he had saved himself from utter destitution by marrying the niece of a Pope (Nicholas I.), and had then shown his attachment, first to Nicholas, by robbing him, while he lay in his last agony, of money he had set aside for the poor, and then to his wife, by deserting her for his mistress whom he swore to marry. Of this vile company, some, at least, of the women were just as bad as the men. In the same company as those already mentioned, the Pope classes a certain Constantiana, another daughter of the nomenclator Gregory. Lawfully married to Cessarius, the son of Pippin, "a most powerful vestararius," she did not hesitate, on the ruin of her father-in-law's fortunes, to publicly marry Gratian, though Cessarius was still alive. But, as true

[1] Ep. 24, April 21, 876. A letter read at the Council of Pontion.

to Gratian as she had been to Cessarius, she fled with a third man.

Such were some of the Roman *nobles* of the ninth century. It could not even then have required a prophet to foretell what would be the unspeakable condition of Rome and the papacy, if the city were to fall, as it was soon to do, into the hands of men and women whose swinish lust was only second to their cruelty and avarice. At the moment, however, there was safety for Rome. The reins of government were in strong hands.

From the letter from which the sombre particulars just cited have been extracted, it is clear that accusations against Gregory and his family connections were in the first instance laid before Charles[1] at Pavia (February 876), and then brought before the Pope (March 31). Summoned to appear before John, they continued putting off doing so, under various pleas; hoping, adds the Pope, in the meantime to overthrow him either by themselves, or by the aid of the Saracens, whom they had summoned to their assistance. Baffled, however, by the watchfulness of the Pope, and feeling too guilty to await trial, they fled, along with Formosus, with the treasures of the Church, which Gregory had under his charge. Thereupon, in a synod (April 19) held in the Pantheon, John decided as follows with regard to the accused. On the charge of having made an unlawful compact with Boris of Bulgaria, and of having conspired against "the safety of the republic and of the Emperor Charles, by us elected and consecrated," Formosus was declared excommunicated, unless he presented himself for trial before the 29th, deprived of his

[1] And that, too, on his initiative "Zelo christianæ religionis, Ecclesia Dei quæ penes nos est, instinctuque dilecti filii nostri serenissimi imperatoris . . . . per Petrum ep., penes præfatum spiritalem filium lacrymabilem suggestionem deposuit." Ep. 24, *ib.*

sacerdotal rights if he did not appear before May 4, and irrevocably anathematised[1] if he had not given an account of his conduct by the 9th of May. On the charge of the commission of the crimes above laid to their account, corresponding sentences were passed on Gregory, Sergius, and the others. Owing to the non-appearance of the accused, the sentences thus threatened were finally decreed (June 30).[2]

The festival of the *Cornomannia*.

But whether men are joyful or sad, the year rolls on, and brings with it its routine of festivals, sacred and profane. And so, in the midst of all the troubles which the year 876 brought to John VIII., Easter came, with its joys of body and soul, with its festivities civil and ecclesiastical. Among the secular amusements of the season was the ancient and popular festival of the *Cornomannia*, which, until the troubles of the reign of Gregory VII., used to be held in the Pope's presence on Easter Saturday,[3] which in 876 fell on April 21.

A copy of the *Polyptycus*[4] of Canon Benedict, found by

[1] Owing to the different uses of the word 'anathema' in canon law, it is not easy to lay down exactly what was the precise difference in the sentences decreed against Formosus. But doubtless here by 'anathema' was understood the 'greater excommunication,' which was often proclaimed with various solemn ceremonies. By the 'greater excommunication' a person is deprived of *all* the spiritual goods which the Church has at her disposal. It involves—besides certain more remote effects, such as 'suspicion of heresy,' if for a whole year a person contumaciously remains under the excommunication—a deprivation of the sacraments, of the right to be present at the services of the Church, of the prayers of the Church, of ecclesiastical burial, of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, of rights before the law, and of civil society. *Cf. Tractatus de Excom.*, ap. Gury, *Compend. Theol. Moral.*, Ratisbonæ, 1874.

[2] Besides the letter of John (Ep. 24), *cf.* the *Acts* of these synods published by Richter, which are thought to be, at least, based on authentic documents. *Revue des Quest. Hist.*, xxviii. 418.

[3] "Sabbato de albis quando laudes cornomannie canende sunt domino pape." *Polyptycus Benedicti*, ed. Fabre.

[4] Compiled in 1142 from earlier materials.

the late Paul Fabre,[1] which proved to be more complete than the one published by Mabillon,[2] enables us to give a full account of this quaint festivity, which was closely connected with the feast of fools, the feast of asses,[3] and the feast of children.

After mid-day on Easter Saturday the archpriests of the eighteen deaconries (or parishes) were to assemble the people in the churches by the sound of the bell. Then the sacristan, clad in a white garment, with his head crowned with flowers and two horns as though he were Silenus, and carrying in his hand a brazen wand covered with little bells and followed by the archpriest in a cope, led a procession of the people to the Lateran palace. There, in front of its principal entrance, the crowd halted, and awaited the coming of the Pope. On his appearance the people formed into a huge circle, each parish grouped about its archpriest, and then the whole body intoned the *laudes* in honour of the Pope. Whilst in both Greek[4] and Latin verses every blessing was being wished to the Pope "who in Peter's

[1] Edited by him, ap. *Travaux et mém. des facultés de Lille*, t. i., mém. 3, p. 18 ff. Lille, 1889.

[2] *Mus. Ital.*, ii., Ordo xi., and thence in *P. L.*, t. 78.

[3] On the feast of fools and of asses, see Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, no. ix.

[4] The Greek appears in a very strange form in Benedict's work. "Yco despota chere mezopanto, etc., standing for

Σὺ, ὁ δέσποτα, χαῖρε,
χαῖρε μετ (ὰ τ)ῶν πάντω(ν)," etc.

The Latin *laudes* open:

"Euge benigne qui vice Petri
papa Johannes, cuncta gubernas."

Much is said too of the season of the year:

Marcuis instat Quo nemus omne
mensis ubique, fundit odores
quo Deus auctor prebet et altis
cuncta creavit. montibus umbram.

And, characteristically, the Quirites finish by asking for gifts:

Munera cunctis qui pius extas
grata repende semper egenis!

place rules all things," the sacristan danced about before the people, shaking his bells. When the *laudes* were over, one of the archpriests mounted an ass with his face towards its tail, and bending backwards was entitled to keep for himself as many denarii as he could in three attempts take from a basin-full which a papal chamberlain held at the ass's head. Crowns were then laid at the pope's feet by the clergy; the archpriest of S. Maria in Via Lata offering him also a little vixen which was allowed to run away. In return he received from the Pope a byzant[1] and a half. The archpriests of S. Maria in Aquiro and of S. Eustachius, after respectively presenting a cock and a doe,[2] received a byzant and a quarter; whilst the other archpriests received a byzant apiece. The papal benediction brought the proceedings to a close as far as the Pope was concerned.

Still clad in his fancy dress and accompanied by a priest with two attendants carrying holy water, light cakes, and boughs of laurel, the sacristan went dancing along from house to house, shaking his bells. Whilst the priest blessed the houses with holy water, placed the boughs on the hearth, and gave the cakes to the children, the sacristan and the two attendants sang this "barbaric chant" "Iaritan, Iaritan, Iarariasti, Raphayn, Iercoyn, Iarariasti." The master of the house brought the festival of the Cornomannia to an end by a donation of a penny or two.[3]

On the particular occasion of which we are speaking,

[1] It is curious that the name for the gold *aureus* of Constantinople is thought to have been first used by John VIII. *Cf.* Ducange, *sub voce* byzantius.

[2] As a deer is connected with the story of the conversion of St. Eustachius, it is easy to understand why the doe was offered, but no reason has yet been discovered why the vixen and the cock were presented by the archpriests of the two S. Marias.

[3] The *ordo* closes with the words: "Hoc fuit usque ad tempus p. Gregorii VII., sed postquam expendium guerre crevit, renuntiavit hoc," p. 23.

however, the ordinary singing of the *schola cantorum* was replaced by a recitation of the so-called *Cæna Cypriani*. This supposed production of the great saint of Carthage was introduced into Rome by the 'philosopher' Charles the Bald. It portrayed an imaginary feast, in which most of the important characters of both the Old and New Testament were depicted as taking part. From this old piece of prose, John the Deacon, well known to us as the biographer of Gregory the Great, made "a burlesque poem of doubtful taste," to which he added a prologue, an epilogue, and a dedicatory letter to John VIII. It is from these additions, newly edited and commented on by Lapôtre, with all his wonted learning and ingenuity, that we know something of the way in which the ancient *Cæna*[1] was received at Rome by the court of John VIII.[2] Before the deacon's poetic version of it was finished, it had been recited before the Pope twice this very year (876)—the first time when it was introduced to his notice by the learned monarch of the Franks, and the second time on Easter Saturday. When the Emperor Charles the Bald, clad in the gorgeous raiment[3] of which he was so fond, first caused it to be recited in Rome by his Frankish poets,—*cum francigenis poetis*,—the ancestors of the trouvère and the troubadour, not only was it applauded by him and 'his drinking Gauls,' but it seems also to have enchanted the papal court. In a few words, the deacon gives a striking picture of its effect on the chief Roman ecclesiastics. While the learned librarian Anastasius explained the more obscure allusions of the piece—and many of them were curious and recondite enough—the simple-minded Zachary

[1] The original *Cæna Cypriani* may be read ap. *P. L.*, t. iv., p. 926 ff.

[2] *Le 'Souper' de Jean Diacre*, by M. A. Lapôtre, ap. *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist.*, 1901.

[3] "Prodigus in vestibus." *Ib.*, *Prolog.*, p. 319.

of Anagni[1] listened in wondering amazement, and the hagiographer, Gaudericus of Velletri, fell back on his couch with laughter.[2]

When for the second time the *Cæna* was recited in Easter week for the amusement of the Pope, it was declaimed by the *prior* of the *schola cantorum*, the sub-deacon Crescentius, who, to judge even from the humorous and bantering description of him furnished us by the lively deacon, must have been somewhat of a *character*. If the little, old, asthmatical, and stammering *prior* was calculated to provoke laughter under ordinary circumstances, he must have been perfectly irresistible when, mounted on an ass, he appeared before the papal court, like a Silenus, crowned with flowers and decorated with horns. And no wonder even the singers themselves could not control their laughter[3] when the old man, overcome by his own risible faculties, by his cough, and by his desperate efforts to enunciate difficult scriptural names, was unable to keep a sufficient guard "over all nature's outlets,"[4] but "pedens crepabit tussiendo." The deacon might well assure the Pope that, if he caused his new poetical rendering of the *Cæna* to be read by old Crescentius, the man would have

[1] Whom John elsewhere (p. 321) calls "simplex Job."

[2] "Ridens cadit Gaudericus supinus in lectulum
Zacharias admiratur, docet Anastasius." P. 321.

[3] "Hac ludat papa romanus in albis paschalibus,
Quando venit coronatus scolæ prior cornibus,
Ut Silenus, cum asello, derisus cantantibus,
Quo sacerdotalis lusus designet mysterium." P. 319.

[4] "Video ridere certet quam scurra Crescentius
Ut cachinis dissolvatur, torqueatur rictibus;
Sed prius pedens crepabit tussiendo vetulus
Quam regat linguam condensis balbus in nominibus." *Ib.*

If we take into account the circumstances under which this recitation was given, and its object, viz., to use laughter as a help to teach the mysteries of the faith—*quo sacerdotalis lusus designet mysterium*—we may regard this performance as one, at least, of the steps in the production of the *Mystery Plays* of the later Middle Ages.

to be made of marble who could refrain from laughing. But John VIII. had something else to do besides listening to poems, even when recited by Crescentius Balbus.

John applies for a revocation of the constitution of 824.

With the Saracens at his gates, with traitors within the city, and with many of the neighbouring Christian princes, even those whose duty it was to afford protection to the Holy See, in alliance with the infidels, what wonder if John longed for a freer hand to deal with all these difficulties? What wonder if he wished to make Rome fully subject to the Pope alone, as it was under the pontificate of Paschal I. (817–24), which he had known in his youth, and if he wished to revert to the pact of 817, which assured to the popes protection and yet independence? Accordingly, with this end in view, he despatched an embassy to Charles.

The synod of Pontion, 876.

The papal legates, viz., his nephew, Bishop Leo, now apocrisiarius of the Holy See, and Peter, bishop of Fossombrone, found Charles engaged in celebrating at Pontion a synod which he had summoned "by the authority of the Pope and the advice of the papal legates (John of Toscanella, John of Arezzo, and Ansegisus of Sens), and with his own sanction."[1] At the first session (June 21, 876) was discussed the appointment by John VIII. of Ansegisus of Sens as his permanent legate in Gaul and Germany (*per Gallias et Germanias*),[2] "to lessen the stress of the work from those parts with which

[1] Hinc., *Annal.*, ad 876. A summary of the acts of this council, as far as Hincmar thought fit to give them, is to be found in the place just cited.

[2] *Cf.* the letter of the Pope (Ep. 15) on this subject, read before the synod. An old chronicler of Sens, Odorannus, who in 1045 was sixty years of age, in view of this office of Ansegisus, says of him: "Secundus papa appellari meruit" (Opusc. ii., ap. Mai, *Spicil. Rom.*, t. ix.). From the fact that Odorannus assures us that the primacy of Ansegisus was unanimously accepted, whereas Hincmar tells us of great opposition to it, we may safely conclude that the truth lies between the two assertions. The Chronicle (Opusc. ii.) of Odorannus is very brief. It is also printed ap. *P. L.*, t. 142.

the Pope had to deal. That anyone in Gaul should be put over him, was not in the least to the taste of Hincmar. However, when Charles could get nothing further from the archbishops than that they would obey the Pope, *saving their rights*, he caused Ansegisus to be placed next to the legates, despite the audible murmur of Hincmar that such an act was contrary to the canons.

In the next session, the choice which the Pope had made of Charles for emperor, and which had been ratified by the diet (synod) at Pavia (February 876), was confirmed by the assembled prelates.[1] At the assembly of Pavia the 'acts' of the coronation at Rome had been read and approved. In these 'acts' the Pope is reported as declaring that, because he believes it to be the will of God, as did also, he knows, his predecessor, Pope Nicholas, "we have with good reason elected and approved (of Charles), with the consent and wish of all our fellow-bishops, and of the other ministers of the holy Roman Church, and of the senate, and of all the Roman people, and of the 'gens togata.' And, in accordance with ancient custom, we have solemnly advanced him to the sceptre of the Roman empire, and have adorned him with the title of Augustus, anointing him with oil without, to show the power of the inward unction of the Holy Spirit." The Pope goes on to assert that Charles had not himself assumed the title of emperor; but, as one invited by us, had come humbly with the intention of working for the peace of the empire and the exaltation of the Church. "And unless we had known that such was his intention, never would we have

[1] "Lecta est electio domni imperatoris ab epp. et ceteris Italici regni firmata, sed et capitula quæ in palatio Ticinensi constituit et ab omnibus confirmari præcepit, quæ et ab episcopis cisalpinis præcepit confirmari" (Hincmar, *ib.*); Odorannus (*ib.*), "Cujus (papæ) sacris institutionibus pro debito parentes, quod ipse confirmavit, pari consensu omnes confirmavimus."

been so ready to promote him."[1] After these acts had been read before the assembly at Pavia, the bishops and nobles there gathered together had declared that, as the Divine goodness, through the intervention of the Vicar of the Apostles, their spiritual father, Pope John, had raised "the most glorious Emperor Charles" to the imperial dignity, they also with one accord "chose him as their protector, lord and defender."[2] The act of submission to the new emperor, which had been thus made by the *optimates* of the kingdom of Italy, was then imitated by the nobility of the West Franks at Pontion, who declared that, as first Pope John at Rome and then all the nobles of Italy at Pavia had elected Charles as emperor, so they from France did the same with the like unanimity and devotion.

In other sessions of the synod the letters of the Pope to the bishops of Germany were delivered to the ambassadors of Louis the German, who had come to put forward their master's claims to part of the kingdom of the late Emperor Louis II.; the special legates of the Pope, Leo and Peter, were received; and the condemnation by John of Formosus and his party was read.

The agreement of Pontion.

Though not mentioned by Hincmar in his abridged account of the acts of the assembly at Pontion, we know, from various letters[3] of the Pope, that there was drawn up

[1] (Carolum) "elegimus merito et approbavimus una cum annisu et voto omnium fratrum et coepiscorum nostrorum . . . amplique Senatus, totiusque Romani populi, gentisque togatæ; et secundum priscam consuetudinem solemniter ad imperii Romani sceptra proveximus et Augustali nomine decoravimus, unguentes eum oleo extrinsecus." *Cf.* the acts of the Synod of Pavia, ap. Mansi, t. xvii., p. 310; or *M. G. LL.*, t. i. 528. But *vide infra*, p. 298.

[2] *Ib.* The following additional words to be read in Muratori's copy of the acts of the Synod of Pavia (*R. I. S.*, ii., pt. ii., 150): "et Italici regni regem eligimus," are justly regarded by Pertz and Lapôtre as an interpolation. Lapôtre, p. 260 n.

[3] Writing (Ep. 31) to Landulf of Capua, he tells him of the return of his legates, and that, in an assembly of Frankish bishops and nobles,

at this synod the agreement (a summary of which is given by the anonymous imperialist) by which the relations between the Pope and the empire were to become more like those sanctioned by the decree 'Ego Ludovicus.' The freer hand that John required was given to him. In renewing the concordat (*pactum*) with Rome, the emperor waived "the rights and customs of the empire." He handed over to the Pope the taxes which from various monasteries used to flow into the imperial exchequer, and gave him Samnium and Calabria, all the cities of the duchy of Beneventum, the whole duchy of Spoleto, and two cities of the duchy of Tuscany, viz., Arezzo and Chiusi. He removed from Rome the imperial *missi* (*regias legationes*), and gave up the right of being present by his *missi* at papal elections (consecrations?).[1] That it was really with a diploma to this effect that the papal and imperial envoys reached Rome in September 876, the obvious imperialist

Charles has decreed that the regal rights (*jus potestatis*) formerly granted to the Roman See be renewed and be held by it inviolably. Among these rights the Pope mentions jurisdiction over Capua in express terms. Imperator "omne sane jus potestatis antiquitus (Romanæ ecclesiæ) attributum, capitulariter renovatum in conventu epp. ac optimatum, inviolabiliter concessit habendum. Inter quæ de terra vestra pacta, prout Christo duce voluissemus, statuere nostro juri potestatique commisit." As the above passage as given in Migne is corrupt, we have ventured to put in place of 'renovamus' and 'terræ vestræ,' 'renovatum' and 'terra vestra.' *Cf.* the Pope's letter of thanks to Charles the Bald. Ep. 42.

[1] "Renovavit pactum cum Romanis, perdonans illius jura regni et consuetudines illius, tribuens illis sumptus . . . . de . . . . quamplurimis monasteriis fiscalia patrimonia. Patrias autem Samniæ et Calabriæ, simul cum omnibus civitatibus Beneventi eis contulit, insuper ad dedecorem regni totum ducatum Spoletinum, cum duabus civitatibus Tusciæ . . . . id est Aritium et Clusium. . . . . Removit ab eis regias legationes, assiduitatem vel præsentiam apostolicæ electionis." (*Libell. de imp. Potest.*, sub fine ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 966). "Monumenta progenitorum (avi Caroli, patris Ludovici) æquiparavit," says John himself in his speech at the Council of Ravenna. Harduin, *Conc.*, vi., ap. Watterich.

prejudices of the author of these details are a sufficient guarantee.

But in those days of increasing anarchy through the multiplication of petty tyrants, an imperial decree was often not worth the parchment on which it was written. The envoys of Charles could not or would not carry out their instructions. John had to complain[1] of the insincerity of one of the envoys, even of Ansegisus of Sens, in coming to an understanding with Lambert of Spoleto. It would have required a Charlemagne to enforce the carrying out of his will in Southern Italy at this time. If, later on, John was recognised as suzerain of Capua, that would seem to be all the tangible result that accrued to him from the diploma of Charles the Bald in his favour. And we are expressly informed by Erchempert[2] that Pandonulf, the nephew and successor of Landulf, made his submission to John, and had charters drawn up and money coined in his name.

The claims and death of Louis the German.

Meanwhile Louis the German, who, as we have seen, had supported in arms his claims to the throne of Italy or the imperial crown, endeavoured also to make them good by negotiating with the Pope. To judge from a letter of John to Louis, in reply to others (now lost) received from the king, the Pope was considerably affected by their contents.[3] But when it was written, Louis had been called to a higher tribunal than that before which John invited him to state his case. After a long reign, much disturbed by wars against barbarian invaders and the rebellions of his sons, Louis the German died on August 28, 876. Some time before his death, he had divided his

[1] Ep. 44 to the emperor.

[2] *Hist. Lang.*, c. 47. "Pandonulfus prius subdiderat dicto papæ, in cujus vocamine et cartæ exaratæ et nummi figurati sunt." *Cf.* Ep. 31, and Muratori, *Annal.*, viii. 60; Lapôtre, 311.

[3] Ep. 26, September 1, 876.

kingdom between his three sons. The eldest, Carloman, received Bavaria and Carinthia, and the suzerainty over the Slavs of Pannonia and Moravia; the second, Louis III., known as 'the Young,' had Franconia, Thuringia, and Saxony; and Charles the Fat, afterwards emperor, had the more central portion, Alemania (Swabia, Alsatia, Switzerland).

Attempted aggression of the emperor.

Instead of turning his attention to putting in order the dominions which he had already acquired, and to stopping the destructive inroads of Northman and Saracen, Charles the Bald showed himself no better than any of the other grasping princes of his time. Thinking that the death of his brother offered him a fair opportunity of seizing at least a part of his kingdom, he invaded the realm of Louis the Young. But his usual hurry exposed him to the crushing defeat, which he sustained at Andernach (October 8, 876). His aggressive action stirred up his nephews against him; and their hostility not only prevented him from doing his duty as protector of the Holy See, but even precipitated his death when he attempted to perform it.

John appeals for help against the Saracens, 876-7.

From the close of the year 876 John had been sending letters in all directions to obtain help against the Saracens, who were devastating the whole south of Italy, and, on their light horses, scouring the country even to the walls of Rome. The Pope first tried to get help from Duke Boso, whom Charles had left in North Italy as his representative; but to no purpose. Boso was more intent on his personal aggrandisement than on the public good. Then he turned to the natural defender of the Church, the emperor. He did everything he could to help himself, writing for cavalry horses to Alfonso III., king of Galicia, and for warships to the Greeks, and making every effort, by letters and interviews, to break up the Southern league with the Saracens.[1] But he felt that nothing less than the coming

[1] For details, see below.

of the emperor with a large army would suffice to expel the unbeliever, and curb the insolence of the petty tyrants, especially of Lambert of Spoleto, by whom he was surrounded. Accordingly, from September (876) till well on into May 877, John sent off letter after letter to Charles himself, entreating him to come to his aid, and to the empress and the bishops of the empire, begging them to use their influence with him in the same direction. But, harassed by the Normans and by ill-health, and, with good reason, fearing the resentment of his nephews, Charles for some time paid no heed to the entreaties of the Pope. In his last letter to Charles on this subject,[1] John reminds him that the imperial crown has been bestowed upon him by the will of God, that he may defend the Church from the cruel ravages of the infidels, who are now laying waste everything with fire and sword. They have so devastated Campania, he continues, that there is nothing left for "our support, for that of the Roman senate, or for the upkeeping of the venerable monasteries and the other pious places." There is no inhabitant in the Roman suburbs. "So filled with grief are we at these dire woes, that we can neither take food nor sleep. But in place of sweet repose we have to endure ceaseless toil, and instead of the delights of the feast we have bitterness of soul." He implores the emperor to delay no longer, but to come to the help of the Roman Church, "which with the womb of religion begot you to empire."

The letters of the Pope and the arguments of his legates, whom Charles received about Easter (April 7), at last had their effect on him; and, against the wishes[2] of his nobles, he set out in the summer for Italy, in company with his

The emperor sets out for Italy, 877

[1] Ep. 79, May 25, 877.

[2] Such is the express declaration of the *Annals* of Vaast. *Cf. Annal.* Hinc. et Fuld., ad an. 877.

wife, Richildis. He took with him, in addition to a large sum of money, a force more conspicuous as a cavalcade than formidable as an army.

Council at Rome, Feb. 877.

In Italy, meanwhile, John had been endeavouring to improve the prestige of the emperor, which the disaster at Andernach had considerably weakened. In a synod held in February 877, the election of Charles to the empire was confirmed, and punishments were decreed against whoever should attempt to contravene it.[1] When he was assured that the emperor was really coming to his aid, he went north to meet him, and with his characteristic energy improved the occasion by holding a council at Ravenna.

Council at Ravenna, Aug. 877.

This "universal council of the kingdom[2] of Italy, *i.e.* of the whole province," the Pope summoned[3] "as well for certain necessities of the Church as for the needs of the state." Of the acts of this synod nineteen canons have come down to us. Among them, some forbid bishops-elect to put off their consecration; and others, revealing thereby the state of the times, forbid injury to be done to sacred persons, places or things; rape, murder, mutilations, arson, etc. Finally, John made an effort to prevent the territorial property of the Church from sharing the fate of state property elsewhere in the West. He forbade anyone "to *seek* the patrimonies" of the Roman Church, to get possession of its property under the pretext of a *benefice* (*beneficialiter*) or in any other way. These enactments were aimed against those customs of a growing

[1] Hinc., *Annal.*, ad an. 877. *Cf.* Epp. 49–52 of John, summoning divers persons to this synod. Lapôtre (*Additions et correct.*) refers to *this* council the acts of a Roman (?) council discovered by Fr. Maassen; and, with their discoverer, referred by us to the Roman council of the close of 875. *Vide supra*, 293.

[2] Ep. 80, in which the archbishop of Ravenna is summoned to the council.

[3] *Ib.* *Cf.* Epp. 81–4, 87–8.

feudalism which were sooner or later to deprive the central authorities in Western Europe of all power and wealth. Powerful tenants soon changed into full ownership the usufruct of landed estates, which were granted them as 'benefices' for their lifetime. The patrimonies which are thus forbidden to be alienated are enumerated (can. 15) as: the Appian patrimony, the Labican or Campanian, the Tiburtine, the Theatine, that of both the Sabine territories, and that of Tuscany, the portico of St. Peter's (the Leonine city), the Roman mint (*moneta Romana*), the public taxes, riparian dues (*ripa*), and the harbours, Portus and Ostia. The next canon (16) forbids the alienation of any portions of the above patrimonies (the *massæ*, farms, and the *coloni*, the tillers attached to the soil); and canon 17 extends a like prohibition to the parts "of Ravenna, Pentapolis, Emilia, Roman and Lombard Tuscany, and of all the territory of St. Peter."[1]

At this council also the election of Charles to the empire was confirmed. In his address to the synod, John declared that what he had done *at Rome* in the matter of conferring the imperial crown, he wished to confirm *here* in this general synod, which he had called together for the countless needs of the Church.[2]

After the holding of this synod, at which were present, Meeting of the Pope and emperor, Sep. 877.

[1] Can. 17 (ap. Labbe, ix. 303). "Apostolica auctoritate præcipimus ut amodo et deinceps nullus cujuslibet gentis vel ordinis homo monasteria, cortes, massas et salas, tam per Ravennam, et Pentapolim, et Æmiliam, quam et per Tusciam Romanorum atque Longobardorum, et omne territorium S. Petri Ap. constitutas præsumat *beneficiali more*, aut scripto aut aliquolibet modo petere, recipere vel conferre." *Cf.* Hefele, vi. 97 f.; Gregorovius, iii. 191.

[2] "Nosque, quod *jam in Romana ecclesia* gessimus preces benedictionis fundentes et coronam imponentes, etiam *hic*, in hac generali synodo . . . . iterata roboremus." *Cf.* Jaffé, p. 269. There is no little confusion as to the dates of these confirmations of Charles's election. The account given in the text would seem to be in accord with the authorities.

besides the archbishops of Milan and Ravenna, and the *patriarch* of Grado,[1] forty-eight other bishops from different parts of Italy, the Pope moved west to meet the emperor. They met at Vercelli; and, after a most honourable reception had been accorded to the Pope, they went together to Pavia. Here their conference, from which the Pope had hoped so much, was cut short by the alarming intelligence that Carloman, with a very large force,[2] was marching upon them. While John endeavoured to pacify the king by sending him the presents Charles had given to 'St. Peter,'[3] the emperor, naturally enough, retreated towards France—first to Tortona, where the Pope anointed Richildis as empress, and then to Morienne, to await the arrival of the great nobles of his kingdom. But they would not come. The emperor had left France against their will, and follow him they would not. There was therefore nothing left but that the Pope and Charles should return whence they had come.

Death of the emperor. Oct. 6, 877.

Charles, however, weak in health, was not able to bear up against these troubles. He died of dysentery at *Brios*, thought to be Briançon, a hamlet on the banks of the Isère a little below Moutiers-en-Tarentaise, October 6, 877.[4] After mentioning the death of Charles the Bald, two ancient historians have appended important remarks. Their importance is our reason for citing them. Ademar of Chabannes (†1034), in his Chronicle, founded chiefly on the earlier *Gesta* of the Frankish kings, observes that after Charles the Bald "none of the kings of France

[1] It is with these titles and in this order that we have the signatures of the bishops (Labbe, ix. 305).

[2] "Cum maxima multitudine bellatorum," *Annal. Hinc.*, ad an. "Cum manu valida," *Annal. Fuld.*, ad an. 877.

[3] "Papa munera, quæ imperator transmiserat S. Petro ei (Carlomanno) dedit." *Ann. Vedast.*, 877, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii.

[4] "Mortuus est 2 Nonas Octobris." *Annal. Hinc.*; *cf. Annal. Fuld.*

received the imperial dignity (*imperium*)." The kings who became emperors after Charles the Bald were rulers in either Germany or Italy. The other remark, which serves to show the degradation of the imperial dignity after the demise of Charles the Bald, is the one with which the anonymous pamphleteer of Spoleto (?) closes his work. From the date of the death of Charles "no emperor nor king obtained the royal rights. Owing to the strife and the endless divisions in the empire either power or wisdom failed them. Hence plundering and war became the order of the day."

Master of the situation in North Italy, Carloman set about establishing his authority on a firm basis.[1] But, as so often happened to the German armies that swooped down upon Italy in the Middle Ages, disease fastened upon the soldiers of Carloman. Crowds[2] of his troops only returned to Germany to die. He himself was conveyed home, struck down with a mortal disease, apparently paralysis.

Carloman aspires to the empire.

The first authentic news of Charles's death had come to the Pope from one whose letter revealed also the fact that he himself wished to succeed the late emperor. This candidate for the imperial crown was Carloman, then master of North Italy. His letter to the Pope is lost, but we have John's answer.[3] Considering that the first thought of a Pope at this time would, of course, be to turn

[1] That he stayed *some* time at least in the country, organising his authority, rests not only on the authority of the Annals of Fulda, but is definitely stated by Andrew of Bergamo: "Carlomannus vero regnum Italiæ disponens, post non multum tempus . . . . reversus est." *Hist.*, c. 20.

[2] "Pestilentia quoque ingens secuta est exercitum Carlmanni de Italia redeuntem, ita ut plurimi tussiendo spiritum exalarent." *Annal. Fuld.* *Cf.* Hinc.

[3] Ep. 93, dated simply November (877); *cf.* Ep. 117, to the same Carloman.

for an emperor to the Western Franks,[1] and that John, would regard Carloman as the cause of the death of his friend, Charles the Bald, he, not unnaturally, did not respond to the advances of Carloman with enthusiasm. He expressed his deep sorrow at the death of Charles, and then proceeded to speak of the *coming* of Carloman (to receive, of course, the imperial crown), of his *most sublime promises* to exalt the Roman Church more than all his predecessors, and of the reward he hoped Carloman would get from God when he had fulfilled his engagements. Then, doubtless as well to gain time as to try the worth of his promises, he said that when Carloman had *returned* from the conference, which he told the Pope he was going to hold with his brothers, he would send him a solemn embassy "ex latere nostro," with a charter which would set forth point by point what he would have to grant to the Roman Church. That matter settled, John will send another embassy to conduct the king to Rome. Meanwhile Carloman is asked not to aid in any way the Pope's enemies (Formosus and his party); and while, at the king's prayer, he grants the pallium to Archbishop Theotmar, he begs him in turn to entrust to Theotmar the annual sending to Rome of the revenues belonging to the Holy See in Bavaria.

Is aided by Lambert of Spoleto.

If, however, Carloman was unable through the failure of his health to prosecute his aims with vigour himself, he

[1] In a letter to Charles the Fat (Ep. 142, ad an. 878), after the Council of Troyes, John proclaims his devotion to the kings of the Franks (Western). "Servans fidem Francorum regibus, secundum predecessorum meorum pontificium, multos et duros labores in mari et in terra pertuli." Though here, no doubt, *all* the Franks, and not merely those of France, are referred to, still John would naturally turn, in the first instance, to the issue of the late emperor—the more so that the ruler of France was certainly the principal representative of the Franks, and that, to Italian writers of the ninth century, the *Franks* were the *Gauls*, the inhabitants of 'Francia' (Lapôtre, p. 331).

found a useful ally in Lambert of Spoleto. Or perhaps the truth is, Lambert found it convenient to cloak his own ambition under the pretext of zeal for Carloman. Such a supposition would make his conduct harmonise with that of the great nobles of the period. Besides, we find the Pope himself maintaining that he was merely pretending to act in the name of Carloman, and that he was really aiming at the empire himself.[1] And, in fact, we shall soon see the house of Spoleto producing an emperor.

Lambert's family came originally from the valley of the Moselle. One of his ancestors, another Lambert, had governed the Breton March, but his partisanship with Lothaire had forced him to fly to Italy. In 842, his son Guy (known as the elder) appears as duke of Spoleto, and "with him begins the important part played by this house in the affairs of Italy."[2] Guy's eldest son, Lambert, whom the emperor Louis II. had deprived of his duchy, but who had been restored by Charles the Bald at the request of Pope John, and had been appointed by him to act as the protector[3] of the Holy See, soon showed that he had no gratitude, and that he was concerned about nobody's interests but his own. Before December 876, his men had been preying upon the Roman territory of the Pope.[4] On the retreat of Charles the Bald from Italy, Lambert instantly began to act, nominally, in the interests of Carloman. He sent to the Pope to demand that hostages from the Roman nobility should be sent to him—doubtless as a guarantee of their adhesion to Carloman. Needless to say, he did not get them. With the spirit of the ancient Romans still burning in his aged breast, John let him know that "the sons of

[1] *Cf.* Epp. 115–116 to Louis the Stammerer, king of France. *Cf.* Ep. 106, "Ejus (Carloman) se voluntate jactat talia agere."

[2] Lapôtre, p. 182.

[3] Erchempert, *Hist. Lang.*, c. 39.

[4] Ep. 54, ad Lambertum.

the Romans have never been given as hostages."[1] A little later the Pope threatens Lambert with excommunication if, during his absence, he shall dare in any way to injure "any part of the territory of the Prince of the Apostles, or the city of Rome, which is a city at once sacerdotal and royal."[2] For John had determined to go to *France* by sea, and to visit Carloman "for the benefit and defence of the territory of St. Peter and of the whole of Christendom."[3] The inroads of the Saracens, he writes, he has been enduring for two years; and the daily oppression he suffers at the hands of others will not allow him to remain in Rome in peace and safety, nor to rule his territory and his people with success, and with that power which becomes a king (*regia virtute*). In reply to this letter, Lambert promptly offered to come to Rome to help the Pope, and to bring with him Adalbert, marquis of Tuscany. John, of course, wrote to decline the offer; the more so, because he had heard that one of the objects of his coming was to restore their property and status to his enemies (Formosus, etc.) against his will—a thing which "had never been done to the Pope's predecessors by any emperor, king, or count, within the memory of man."[4]

Lambert gets possession of Rome, 878.

Seeing that negotiation was not likely to forward his schemes, Lambert tried first a hectoring tone in dealing with the Pope, addressing him like a layman, as *your nobility*, and laying down that John's legates must only come to him when they were sent for.[5] Then, as that had no effect, he had recourse to violence. Pretending to be coming to Rome merely on a visit of devotion, he was

[1] Ep. 91, October 21, 877.

[2] Ep. 98. "Quæ est civitas sacerdotalis et regia."

[3] *Ib.* John wanted to go and see for himself who was the best fitted for the imperial crown. Hence he stated his wish to have an interview with Carloman: "Optatam illius contemplari præsentiam cupimus." *Ib.*

[4] Ep. 103.

[5] Ep. 104.

kindly received (in the early part of 878) by the Pope.[1] The next day he threw off the mask. With the aid of Adalbert I.[2] of Tuscany, he seized the city and behaved as he had done before, when he raided it at the time of the election of Hadrian II. For thirty days the two dukes kept the Pope imprisoned in the Leonine city, reintroduced his enemies into the city, and, giving out that they were acting in the name of Carloman, compelled the Roman nobles to swear fealty to that monarch.[3]

When they left the city, John at once excommunicated them, and lost no time in informing the chief men in the empire of the outrage which had been put upon him. He wrote to the ex-empress, Engelberga; to Berenger, duke or marquis of Friuli, 'of royal descent,'[4] and of whom, as one of the future lords, or devastators, of North Italy, we shall have more to say; to John, archbishop of Ravenna; to Louis the Stammerer in France, and to the three kings in Germany. Besides informing the kings of the doings of Lambert, he tells them that, ready if need be to suffer death for the liberation of Christ's flock,[5] he intends to go to *France*, there to hold a council, "most necessary for all Christian peoples";[6] and he exhorts them to come to it themselves with the bishops of their respective kingdoms. With a fleet of three dromons, John set sail for *France*, and

John flies to France, May 878.

[1] Ep. 116. "Romam siquidem clandestina fraude devotum venire se simulans, a nobis velut filius pacis benigne susceptus."

[2] The son of Boniface II., Adalbert was of the Frankish family established by Charlemagne as dukes of Tuscany. We have seen him acting as governor of Corsica under Sergius II.

[3] "Optimates Romanorum fidelitatem Carlomanno sacramento firmare coegerunt." *Ann. Fuld.*, ad an. 878; *cf.* Hinc., an. 878; and Epp. 105, 6, 7; 115, 6, 7, 8; 125 of the Pope.

[4] His father, Eberhard, had married Gisela, the daughter of Louis the Pious.

[5] Ep. 115. "Non recuso pro Christi . . . . ovium . . . . liberatione mori."

[6] Ep. 116 to Louis the Stammerer. *Cf.* Epp. 116, 7, 8, 125.

landed at Arles on May 11.[1] Here he was much impressed with what he saw of Boso and his wife Hermengard, the daughter of the late emperor Louis II. Boso, who was to make himself king of Provence (October 879), had been appointed his vicar in Lombardy by the emperor Charles the Bald. With the stupid Charles the Fat, and the unhealthy Louis the Stammerer, and with Louis the Young and Carloman as the representatives of the house of Charlemagne, no wonder that John, who was a man of vigour and intelligence himself, if ever there was one, looked with favour on the energetic and ambitious young couple at Arles. If it be conceded that John was really anxious to have the best and strongest man he could find as emperor—and there is no historical ground for refusing the concession—then his seeming hesitancy at this period admits of a ready explanation. With the weak characters he had in the ordinary course to deal with in the first instance, John knew not what to do. That he was attracted to Boso is clear from his letter to that prince's mother-in-law, the dowager empress Engelberga. He tells her that, by the mercy of Heaven, he has in good health reached the territory of 'her darlings;' that there he has found everything prosperous, and that "for the affection he bears her and her late husband, he will exert himself for their benefit, seek at their hands protection for the Roman Church, and, if he can do so with honour, strive to raise them to yet higher honour."[2] As an immediate proof of his good-will towards them, he restores[3] to the See of Arles its

[1] Hinc., an. 878. Furnished with two banks of oars, the dromons carried 230 rowers and sailors and 70 marines. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzant. Empire*, pp. 299, 331.

[2] "Eosdemque . . . . ad majores excelsioresque gradus modis omnibus, salvo nostro honore, promovere desideramus." Ep. 121, ad Angelbergam.

[3] Epp. 123, 124.

old position as representative of the Apostolic See in Gaul.

Meanwhile, however, he remained true to the Carolingian house. Honourably received by Louis and his nobles,[1] he exerted himself with his characteristic energy[2] to bring about a meeting of the bishops of the whole empire and the four kings "for the exaltation of the whole of Christendom." The assembly was fixed for the 1st August;[3] but the ill-health[4] of Louis of France delayed matters. At length the synod, at which only the bishops of "the Gallic and Belgic provinces"[5] and King Louis of France were present, was opened on August 11. The proceedings commenced with a relation of the doings and of the excommunication of Lambert. Following Hincmar of Rheims, the assembled bishops expressed their adhesion to what had been done by the Pope in these words: "According to the sacred canons, which have been instituted by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and consecrated by the reverence of the whole world, those whom the Pope and the Holy Roman Church, the mother of all churches by the privilege of S. Peter, condemn, I condemn; those whom they excommunicate, I regard as excommunicated; whom they receive, I receive; and whatever, following the Holy Scriptures and the sacred canons, they hold, I will ever hold, with the help of God, to the best of my know-

The synod of Troyes, Aug. 878.

[1] *Ann. Vedast.*, 878.

[2] Witness his letters, 126–141, to the kings and the metropolitans.

[3] Ep. 137 to Engelberga. "Vos scire cupimus quia apud Trecas in Kalendis Augusti una cum rege Ludovico, imperatoris Caroli filio, et cum universis Galliæ episcopis synodum universalem celebrabimus; dehinc Carolomannum regem suosque germanos alloquemur, ut pari omnium consilio consolationem nostræ Eccles. reperiamus."

[4] Hinc., ad an. 878. "Propter suam infirmitatem." In Ep. 139 the Pope has to sympathise with the state of Carloman's health too!

[5] Hinc., an. 878. Acts of the synod, ap. Labbe, ix. 307 f.; Hefele, vi. 101.

ledge and ability."[1] The excommunication of Formosus, Gregory, George, and the rest of their party was renewed; decrees were passed against episcopal translations, and against such as plundered Church property; the affair of Hincmar of Laon was concluded, and various disciplinary canons enacted. Further, with regard to Formosus, who had meanwhile betaken himself to France, we are told by Auxilius[2] (who assures us that he had his information from an eye-witness, viz., Peter, archdeacon of the Church of Naples) that John caused him to be brought before him, and forced him to sign a written undertaking never to resume his dignities nor to return to Rome.[3]

Coronation of Louis the Stammerer, Sep. 878.

Although John crowned Louis as king[4] (September 5), he was not named emperor. Whether Louis was unwilling to take on his feeble shoulders the burden of empire, or whether his nobles or his infirmities dissuaded him from trying to seize the dazzling phantom, we know not. However, as the other three Carolingian kings did not trouble themselves to come to the synod, John seems to have made up his mind not to trouble about them; but, at the first convenient opportunity, to raise Boso to the dignity of emperor.

Boso adopted by the Pope.

At any rate, he came to some arrangement with Louis of France by which Boso[5] was to be the special protector of the Holy See. And of this arrangement, while blaming

[1] Ap. Labbe, p. 307.

[2] Of him something will be said when the authorities for 'Formosus' are treated of.

[3] Aux. *In defens. s. ordin. Formosi P.*, c. iv.; ap. *Auxilius und Vulgarius*, p. 64, by Dümmler, who compares the pamphlet, *Inf. et Def.*, c. 20 and 32.

[4] Hinc., an. 878. He would not, however, crown his queen Adelaide. Regino (an. 878) supplies the reason. In his youth, and unknown to his father, Louis had espoused Ansgarda. He had afterwards been compelled by Charles to put her away and take Adelaide.

[5] And with Boso himself he came to some secret understanding. Ep. 222, ad Bosonem. See below.

the sovereigns of Germany for their non-attendance at the synod, he took care to inform them through a letter to Charles the Fat. After setting forth the trouble to which he has put himself in order to keep faith with the kings of the Franks, he continues: "Through my legates and letters I made every effort to bring all of you (*reges Francorum*) together, that you might try to fulfil the agreement (*pactum*) which your father and your fathers' fathers promised on oath to keep with the Holy Roman Church. But alas! through disobedience you all neglected to come, except King Louis (the son of the emperor Charles), by whose advice and encouragement I have made the glorious prince Boso my adopted son, that he may look after my worldly affairs and leave me free to attend to the things of God.[1] Wherefore be you content with the present boundaries of your kingdom and keep the peace, as we are resolved to excommunicate whoever shall attempt to harass our above-mentioned son."

John returns to Italy.

After transacting various business—conferring privileges on monasteries, granting the pallium to Walo, bishop of Metz, confirming the rights of the archbishop of Tours over

[1] "Cujus (Ludovici) consilio atque hortatu, Bosonem gloriosum principem per adoptionis gratiam filium meum effeci; ut ille in mundanis discursibus, nos libere in his quæ ad Deum pertinent, vacare valeamus." Ep. 142 to Charles the Fat. *Cf.* Ep. 169, where John informs Count Suppo, who was holding an influential command in North Italy, that Boso had been given him by Louis to lead him back to the city, safe from "the accursed Lambert." The German *Annals of Fulda*, indeed, relate as follows: "Assumpto Bosone . . . . cum magna ambitione in Italiam rediit (Papa), et cum eo machinari studuit, quomodo regnum Italicum de potestate Carlmanni auferret; et ei tuendum committere potuisset (ad an. 878). But what a person cannot hold, or has never held, cannot be said to be taken away from him. And the "regnum Italicum" was never 'in the power' of Carloman. It was the object of John to get it into the 'power' of some real master. *Cf.* Ep. 215 (an. 879) of the Pope to Charles the Fat—wherein he states that the Italian kingdom was "inordinatum et sine defensione"—"taliter occupatum!"

in the early part of 879 he wrote[1] to him that the time had now come for him to bring to effect what had been secretly arranged between them. "Waiting for the fulfilment of your promise, we are reduced to the greatest sadness on account of the ravages of the pagans with which we are incessantly harassed. As yet, we have not sought elsewhere for help against our pressing necessities. If, then, you are going to act, act at once; if not, let me know forthwith." But though Boso was urged on by a wife who was as ambitious as Lady Macbeth, and who declared to him that "she, who was the daughter of an emperor and who had once been affianced to the emperor of Greece (to Constantine, the son of Basil the Macedonian), was loth to live if she did not make her husband[2] a king"—he was unwilling to risk anything for the imperial crown. He knew that Louis of France was in a dying state (he died April 10, 879); and, likely enough, thought it would be easier for him to extend his duchy and turn it into a kingdom, when he had only the youthful sons of Louis to oppose him, than to cross the Alps, force the Italian nobles to obey him, and brave the enmity of the German kings.

But becomes a king.

And so it turned out; for he was elected king of Provence by twenty-five bishops at Mantaille, October 15, 879. Though this election was certainly not in accordance with the wishes of Pope John, his influential position among the Franks is clearly brought out by it; for those who framed the decree of Boso's election were careful, when setting forth his claims to honour, to call attention to the fact that "the apostolic lord John of Rome" not only

[1] Ep. 222. This letter, like so many others of this Pope's letters, bears no date. But it was evidently written in the early part of the year, say February, as he tells Boso that his return to Rome was prosperous. It was certainly written before April 3, the date of the letter (Ep. 204) in which John turns to Charles the Fat.

[2] Hincmar, an. 879.

embraced him as his son and loudly praised his nobility of character, but on his return to Rome entrusted himself especially to his care.[1]

What is known of the election of the kings of the Franks at this period, shows us how expressly the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction was acknowledged, especially on occasions of the transaction of concerns which were then regarded as of a more or less spiritual character, such as the election of kings, and amply foreshadows the central position to be taken in the affairs of Europe by the popes of the later Middle Ages. And so we find Boso declaring not only that he professes the Catholic faith, but that he will submit to the authority of the Gospel, of the popes, and of just laws.[2] However, for thus proving false to his engagements, and showing himself merely a self-seeker, John not unnaturally looked upon him as a disturber and a tyrant.[3]

John trusts to Charles the Fat.

But help against the Saracens must be had; and the name of emperor must not be allowed to die out. For if it be granted that at this period there was little more than name about the imperial dignity, there was still 'much virtue' in that name. The name of 'emperor' carried with it prestige. In the churches he was publicly

[1] "Ipse etiam tantum non solum in Galiis, sed et in Italia cunctis enituit, ut domnus apostolicus Johannes Romensis instar filii complexus ejusdem sinceritatem multis præconiis extulerit, et ad suam tutelam revertens ad sedem propriam delegerit." Decree ap. *Capitular.*, ed. Bor., ii. 368.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 367. And so Louis the Stammerer declared (*ib.*, 364) "regulas a patribus conscriptas et *apostolicis adtestationibus* roboratas .... me servaturum."

[3] Ep. 306 to Ottram, bishop of Vienne. John blames the bishop for favouring, "His qui cum Bosone præsumptore et regni perturbatore tyrannidem exercere non cessant." *Cf.* Ep. 295 to Charles the Fat. He assures Charles, "Nam nihil nobis de parte ipsius (Bosonis) pertinere videtur, qui talem tyrannidem præsumpsit committere." This letter belongs to the year 880.

prayed for.[1] And it was no small gain in those days, when little else was respected but brute force, that there was one whom princes and people alike *thought*, at least, that they ought to look up to and respect. As, then, the beginning of the year 879 still found Western Europe without an emperor, and Italy practically without any supreme ruler at all, John summoned (March) a synod to meet on May 1st, that he might arrange with the bishops of Italy what was necessary for the benefit of Church and State. "And because, as we have heard, Carloman's health will not allow him to hold the kingdom, we must consult together about the election of a new king. Before that date, you must not acknowledge any king without our consent. For he who is to be raised (*ordinandus*) to the empire by us, must be called and elected by us most especially."[2] Meanwhile, in reply to a communication received from Charles the Fat, the Pope wrote[3] (April 3) to him to send ambassadors at once, that with them measures might be taken for the good of the Church and of the State, and for the honour of Charles himself; and not to hesitate to come himself. In another letter[4] to the same king he adds that, thinking the cause of his non-appearance might be the opposition of Carloman, he has written to that prince and admonished him that to keep this kingdom in such a disordered and defenceless state any longer is to risk his soul's salvation; and that, consequently, he must not dare to hinder Charles from coming to defend the Church.

Then to the other German kings, 879.

But things were not destined to turn out well for the anxious pontiff. His synod of May 1st was unable to

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. p 16. *Cf.* Agobard (†840), *Liber Apol.*, n. 3, ap. *P. L.*, t. 104, p. 312.

[2] Ep. 200. *Cf.* Ep. 197 of March 5, to Romanus of Ravenna, who had but recently been elected to that See. *Cf.* Epp. 176–7.

[3] Ep. 204. [4] Ep. 215.

effect much, as Anspert of Milan again failed to present himself. And though the disobedient archbishop was excommunicated,[1] Charles did not act. In his despair, we find John appealing now to one and now to another of the three brothers. Unfortunately, the paucity of fully dated letters prevents us from determining whether John observed any order in addressing his appeals to the brothers, or whether he sent them off simply to the one whom he thought most likely to come to his help at the moment. Thus Wibod, bishop of Parma, the Pope's agent, is plainly told by him[2] to try Carloman, or, if his infirmities unfit him, Charles. For he (the Pope) is so harassed by the infidels that he would be glad of the help of any of the kings. And hence, as Charles would not move, and Carloman could not, John tried to induce Louis (the Young) to come and help him. "If with the help of heaven you receive the Roman empire, all kingdoms are subject[3] to you!" But Louis was busy intriguing for the reversion of the kingdom of the paralysed Carloman, and fighting for as much of that of the late Louis of France as he could lay his hands upon. June 7th saw a despatch for aid sent off even to Carloman.[4] From a letter of the Pope, which Lapôtre assigns to September, it appears[5] that Carloman, feeling his inability to look after Italy himself, transferred the care of it to John.

Charles the Fat enters Italy.

Whether or not it was this act of his brother which had an effect upon Charles, at any rate John was not long

[1] Epp. 223–4. [2] Epp. 216, 221.

[3] Ep. 242. "Si, Deo favente, Romanum sumpseritis imperium, omnia vobis regna subjecta existent." This letter was written after April 10, as it supposes the death of Louis the Stammerer.

[4] Ep. 227.

[5] Ep. 281. "Filius noster Carolomannus gloriosus rex suis regalibus litteris, et missorum nostrorum verbo, nostro præsulatui pio mentis affectu commisit, ut *nos curam hujus regni Italici* haberemus."

the ruler of Italy. Coming to an understanding[1] with his brothers, Charles the Fat entered Italy, October 26, 879. Advancing straight to Ravenna, he summoned to his side the Pope and the bishops and nobility of Italy. By them he was proclaimed king, and then, "with the exception of the bishop of the Apostolic See," he constrained them to swear fealty to him.[2] Before they parted, the Pope and the new king of Italy had a conference on the subject of the imperial crown. The Pope hoped for an increase of the privileges of the Roman Church, and especially for help against "the ferocious severity" of his enemies. He wanted Charles "to renew and confirm one of the treaties (*pactum*) and the privileges of the Holy Roman Church, after the manner of his predecessors."[3] Unable, however, to make any headway at all with Charles in these respects, John returned to Rome "to find that matters had gone from bad to worse." Hearing that Charles was about to recross the Alps, he sent another embassy to him begging him to take measures to protect "the territory of St. Peter" from the Saracens and from "bad Christians," and assuring him that the only way to ensure the safety of the Church was for him to come to Rome in person. If Charles will do this and fulfil his engagements, the Pope on his side will work for the king's "honour and glory."[4]

But Charles, who left Italy early in the year 880 to wage

Charles leaves Italy, 880.

[1] Hinc., an. 879. *Cf. Ann. Augienses et Weingartenses*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i., and various catalogues of the kings of Italy, ap. *M. G. SS. Langobard.* "Carlomannus fratri suo Carolo Italiam gubernandam concessit," says the continuator of the history of Erchanbert (853), ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii. *Cf.* Ep. 275. Carloman died March 22, 880.

[2] "Ab eis (episcopis, etc.) rex constituitur et omnes, præter Apostolicæ sedis episcopum, jurejurando ad devotionem servitii sui constrinxit." (Contin. Erchanb., *ib.*). *Cf.* Ep. 260, and *Ann. Vedast.*, 880.

[3] "*Unum de pactis*, et privilegia S. Rom. Ecclesiæ, more parentum vestrorum, renovare et confirmare studeatis." (Ep. 260.)

[4] Ep. 261.

war upon the upstart monarch Boso, contented himself with sending word to "his marquises on the borders of the Pope's territories" to afford him all necessary help. Needless to say, this they did not do; they only helped themselves at the Pope's expense. Hence a fresh batch of letters[1] was dispatched by John to induce Charles to come to Rome in person.

Returns for the imperial crown.

At length the German king made up his mind to set out for Rome to receive the imperial crown; and, apparently, to obtain it on his own terms. He made, what so many other German monarchs were destined to do after him, a violent dash for Rome.[2] But it did not at all suit the Pope's views that Charles the Fat should have all his own way. He sent legates to him, with a clear statement in writing (*capitulariter*) of what he considered was a fair agreement between them. Unfortunately, this important document has not come down to us. Indeed, we know very little of what happened just at this juncture—not even the exact date of the imperial coronation of King Charles. In the letter in which he informed Charles that he was sending him this memorandum of his wishes, the Pope subjoins: "If you do not completely carry out all the conditions we have laid down, we will ourselves, as far as in us lies, see to what pertains to the honour of the Holy Roman Church. From which course, no violence nor threats of wicked men will have any power to turn us, as long as life remains in our body. In setting down, with great presumption, our memorandum (*jussio*) as absurd, you are only striking yourself, and, like a deaf asp, turning your ear away from what is for your advantage. In fine, by our

[1] Ep. 292, dated June 23, 880; Ep. 295 and Ep. 301, dated October 30, 880.

[2] "Carolus Italiam *subjugat*," say the *Annals of St. Gall*, ad an. 880 (ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 70). The Pope speaks of his coming—"festina, imo potius præcipiti gressu." Ep. 309; dated January 25, 881.

apostolic authority, we definitely forbid you to enter the territory (*terminum*) of St. Peter until our legates have returned to us with full intelligence, and until you have sent us new ones."[1]

The only certain issue of these negotiations with which we are acquainted is that Charles was crowned as emperor, probably in the latter part of the month of February 881.[2] Had the adipose German been in the least degree equal to his position, he might have inaugurated another 'age of Charlemagne,' and staved off the disasters of the tenth century. Even before John died, most of the kingdoms of the different Frankish sovereigns had fallen to him by the death of their rulers. His brother Carloman had died, March 880, and his other brother, Louis the Young, died January 20, 882. The somewhat later deaths of the youthful rulers of France (Louis III., August 4, 882, and Carloman, December 6, 884) made him master, in name at any rate, of practically all the empire of Charlemagne.[3] But he was equally unfit to rule much or little; he had to be deposed (887). Comparing the career of Boso with that of the Carolingian rulers of his time, weak in body or mind, or both, it is clear that in him John had picked out the best man of his time. Things might have been different if the gallant Boso and his intrepid spouse had been allowed to receive the imperial diadem.

Charles the Fat crowned at Rome, 881.

As it was, John could get no aid from the impotent emperor. Owing to his weakness, and to the continued dissensions among the Christian princes of South Italy,

Vain pleadings for help on the part of the Pope.

[1] Ep. 309.

[2] Jaffé, *Regest.*, p. 417 (287). The purity of John's motives in bestowing the imperial crown on Charles is insisted on by Stephen (V.) VI.; the crown was given to him, "ut tutissimo ejus regimine potita pace secura subsisteret." Jaffé, 3413.

[3] Boso maintained his independence in Provence. A posthumous son of Louis the Stammerer, viz., the child Charles the Simple, was in 884 the only living representative of the western Carolingian line.

the Saracen power fixed itself there more firmly than ever. This very year (881) the infidels established themselves in a strong fortress on the Garigliano (the ancient Liris), and from it they plundered the surrounding country with impunity for forty years. But while John, on his side, was willing to take charge of the ex-empress[1] Engelberga, that she might not plot with her son-in-law, Boso, against Charles, his oft-repeated letters[2] for help against the Saracens brought him no aid from the emperor. A diet at Ravenna[3] (February 882), in which were present both the Pope and the emperor and a number of bishops and nobles, does not seem to have led to much. On his return to Rome, John found "that all our coast had been plundered, and the Saracens as much at home in Fundi and Terracina" as in Africa.[4] "Though grievously infirm," continues the Pope, "we went forth to battle with our forces, captured eighteen of the enemy's ships and slew a great many of their men." But it was to no purpose that he asked[5] for aid to be able to render the victory of lasting value, and to resist the violence of Guy of Spoleto, who was continuing the tyrannical opposition of his brother Lambert to the Holy See. The very last letters[6] of John, however, written about a month before he died, show that his last days were somewhat cheered by the news that the emperor was coming 'for the defence and security' of the Roman Church and to expel Guy[7] 'from our territories.'

[1] Epp. 315, 316.

[2] Epp. 320, in which he gives the emperor notice that he is sending him a blessed palm, the emblem of victory. *Cf.* 328, 330.

[3] *Cf.* Jaffé, p. 290.

[4] Ep. 334, a fragment of a letter to the emperor.

[5] *Cf.* also Epp. 344–5. [6] Epp. 365–6.

[7] Only a short time before the Pope had had to complain of the cruelty of a wicked Lombard, "a *man* of the marquis Guy," who in a raid had seized eighty-three men near Narni; and, in cutting off one of the hands of each of them, had not unnaturally been the cause of

But death had given rest to the weary pontiff before the emperor had crossed the Alps.

The Pope and the Saracens.

Even from the foregoing narrative the reader will probably have gathered that of the various troubles against which the heroic pontiff had to struggle during his arduous reign, one was ever before him—the devastations of the Saracens. The letters of the first year of his reign are as full of them as are those of the last. What the Lombards were to Gregory the Great, the Saracens were to Pope John. And as Gregory's difficulties with the Lombards were increased by the vexatious conduct of the Christian exarchs, so those of John with the infidels were bitterly intensified by the unpatriotic conduct of the petty princes of South Italy. The importance and long duration of the Saracen question require that it should be treated of separately, and not simply woven into a part of the narrative.

The Saracens and the Mediterranean.

The enormous empire won by the successors of Mahomet, which extended "at its widest . . . from the Indus to the Atlantic and the Pyrenees, and from the Caspian to the Indian Ocean," was subject till the middle of the eighth century to the Caliphs who ruled at Damascus. But in 750 the Omayyad dynasty, which had succeeded that of the four 'rightly-minded' caliphs who had known 'the Prophet,' was overthrown, and the Abbasid dynasty of Bagdad (750–1258) was established. Till then the caliphate had been practically undivided. But the break-up of the immense Saracenic empire began under the Abbasids. Spain never acknowledged their authority, and it was not long before they lost Africa. The Idrisids founded an

the immediate death of many of them. *Cf.* Ep. 360, to Anselm of Milan, dated August 882. Such were the savages with whom the Pope had to deal. Ep. 354, to the emperor Charles the Fat, also speaks of Guy and his satellites, "qui nostra violenter tulerunt ac retinuerunt."

independent caliphate in Morocco (788); and when the Aghlabids established a new dynasty at Cairowan (south of Tunis) in 800, Egypt was the only part of North Africa which obeyed the caliphs of Bagdad. It is with the Aghlabids, or Aglabites as they are more commonly called, that we are at present concerned. At first, at least, we are assured that they "were not only enlightened and energetic rulers on land, but employed large fleets on the Mediterranean."[1]

In the very first terrific outburst of Moslem fanaticism, Arab galleys had begun to harry its shores. Not fifty years had elapsed since Mahomet's famous flight (622) before Saracen fleets had made descents upon Cyprus and Sicily, and had anchored under the walls of Constantinople itself. In the next century they had burnt towns in Italy. But it was under the Aglabites (800–909) that was witnessed "the greatest ascendancy of the Arabs in the Mediterranean." Aided by Moors from Spain, "their corsairs were the terror of the seas." They took Sicily (827–78), Crete and Malta, Corsica and Sardinia, and we have already seen much of their ravages in Italy. In 840 they established themselves in South Italy, and between that date and 845 the attack of the Saracens on Italy was general.[2] They had rifled St. Peter's in 846, and by about 860 their power was as formidable in South Italy as it was in Sicily.

Angered by the loss of Bari (February 871),[3] and on the other hand favoured by the treachery of Adelgisus towards the emperor Louis II., and then later by that emperor's death (August 875) and by the detestable conduct of some of the princes of Southern Italy, who were constantly

[1] Stanley Lane-Poole, *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, p. 36 (London, 1894), an invaluable book. *Cf.* Poole's *Historical Atlas*, map 77, with its letterpress.

[2] Gay, *L'Italie Méridionale et l'empire Byzantin*, p. 53, Paris, 1904.

[3] *Cf. supra*, p. 187.

seeking their alliance, the Saracens, ever reinforced[1] by fresh bodies of marauders, started again with renewed vigour to prey on the wretched peninsula. They reduced Calabria, as the *toe* of Italy was then called, to the state in which "it had been left by the deluge" (873),[2] and expressed their determination above all things to destroy the city of "the old dotard Peter."[3]

But 'Petrulus senex' has for many a long century shown himself a difficult foe to deal with; and his aged representative of the last quarter of the ninth century had in him a great deal of his master's martial temperament. John met force with force, and in person patrolled the coast.[4] In the first instance he directed all his energies to the breaking up of the alliance which the Southern Italian states had formed with the Saracens; for, by the year 875, the whole of South Italy, except the parts in the hands of the Greeks, was in alliance with the infidel, and was actively siding with them in harrying[6] the papal territory. By letters and embassies John pointed out to the various princes of Naples, Capua, and the rest, how utterly un-Christian was their conduct in thus allying themselves with the greatest enemies of the Cross of Christ.[8] All that

[1] Erchempert, c. 38; *Anon. Salern.*, c. 131.

[2] Erchempert, c. 35.

[3] See the stories in John, the Neapolitan deacon's history of the martyrdom of St. Procopius, ap. *R. I. S.*, i., pt. ii. p. 271 f.

[4] "Joannes . . . . contra Sarracenorum incursus littora peragrabat," says John the Deacon (l. iv., c. 97) in one of the incidental notices of contemporary history which find their way into his *Life* of S. Gregory I.

[6] "Tunc Salernum, Neapolim, Gaietam et Amalfim pacem habentes cum Saracenis, navalibus Romam graviter angustiabant depopulatio" (Erchemp., c. 39). The sense of this passage is more correctly given by Leo Ostiensis in his *Chron. S. Monast. Casin.*, i., c. 40. "Salernitani, Amalphitani (etc.) fœdus cum Saracenis componentes Romam navalibus deprædationibus angustabant." In July 875 a body of the Saracens themselves burnt Comacchio. *Cf.* And. Berg., c. 18. So that on both the eastern and the western coasts were the territories of the Pope harassed.

[8] *Cf.* Ep. 9, and Ep. 59, ap. Loewenfeld, written before June 875.

Charles the Bald, after his coronation as emperor, felt himself able to do by way of assisting the Pope in his difficulties was to commission Lambert of Spoleto and Guy his brother to afford what help they could.[1]

The Pope goes to Naples, etc., 876.

Accordingly, as he had effected nothing by his letters, John set out with the two dukes for Naples, etc., in the early part of the following year (February 17[2]—March 31), although in very bad health, to see what he could do by his personal influence towards breaking up the disgraceful league. He succeeded in detaching from it Guaifer, prince of Salerno, and Landulf, count bishop of Capua.[3] But the complete success of the Pope's mission was marred by the secret treachery of the men who ought to have been working for him. Lambert, who had an understanding with Adelgisus of Beneventum, persuaded Sergius,[4] *magister militum* or Duke of Naples, not to break off his alliance with the Saracens. Of the character of this Sergius we have already seen something in his treatment of his uncle St. Athanasius, the archbishop of Naples. With such a powerful state as Naples at the back of the Saracens, what could John hope to effect against them? However, in dealing with Sergius, he tried mild measures to begin with. He exhorted Athanasius, whom he had just consecrated bishop, to do all that in him lay to draw his brother from the Saracen alliance.[5] To no purpose; John accordingly excommunicated him, and war broke out between him and Guaifer.[6]

[1] Erchemp., c. 39.

[2] For this date, see Lapôtre, p. 304 n. For the health of Pope, see Ep. 71.

[3] *Cf.* Epp. 31–2; Erchemp., *ib.*, who tells us that Guaifer at once distinguished himself by killing a number of the Saracens.

[4] "Consilio Adelgisi et Lamberti deceptus" (Erchemp., *ib.*). "Qui (Saraceni) tunc Neapoli habitabant, et Romanam provinciam penitus dissipabant." *Gesta epp. Neap.*, c. 66, ap. *M. G. SS. Langob.*, p. 436.

[5] Ep. 28, September 9, 876.

[6] Erchempert, c. 39. On the octave day of the excommunication,

The Pope an admiral, April 876.

But all this while John was not merely seeking help from others. He was doing all he could to help himself. The real founder of the pontifical navy, he was actively engaged in building war-ships, especially those of the pattern then known as *dromons*, and in preparing munitions of war of all kinds. And, what was perhaps the hardest task of all, he was trying to infuse into his new marines his own fearless courage;[1] for fear of the Saracen pirates would seem to have filled their hearts. On his return from Naples, he found that "all our coast about Fundi and Terracina had been ravaged by the Saracens, and that they had taken up their abode there as though at home." Although very unwell, John only rested five days in Rome. He then put to sea, and overtook the pirate fleet off the promontory of Circe, at the extremity of the Pontine marshes. Eighteen of the enemy's vessels were captured by the Papal squadron, many of their men slain, and about six hundred captives liberated.[2] Surely this is enough to show that there was nothing of the woman about John

the same historian tells us that Guaifer captured twenty-five Neapolitan soldiers; and, in accordance with the Pope's instructions (sic enim monuerat papa), had them beheaded. It is to be presumed that it is on this passage, and on another in one (Ep. 352) of his letters, where John orders some Saracen prisoners to be put to death, that are founded the charges of cruelty often so freely brought against him. With regard to the Saracens, John only did what any modern European government would have done. He ordered robbers and pirates to be hanged. As for the case of the Neapolitan soldiers, we know *nothing* of the circumstances of the affair. These soldiers *may* have been Saracens too.

[1] "Dromones cum ceteris navibus construentes, et cetera vasa bellica et apparatus, quin potius et ipsos animos hominum preparantes, et adversus hostiles incursus indesinenter armantes." Ep. 336, a fragment of a letter to Engelberga. *Cf.* Guglielmotti, *Storia della marina pontificia*, vol. i. l. i., cc. 16, 17; ed. Firenze, 1871.

[2] This engagement is referred by Balan (p. 70) to the year 880. But the facts concerning it are related in a fragment of a letter (Ep. 334) "to the emperor and empress," viz., to Charles the Bald and Richildis. *Cf.* Ep. 344, and Ep. 19 (an. 876) to Alphonso.

even in the midst of old age and sickness. Of this victory John at once informed Charles the Bald and his wife, and also Alphonso III. "Like you," he writes to the last-named, "are we constrained by the pagans; and day and night have we to fight with them. But Almighty God has given us[1] victory over them."

The Pope's appeals for help, 876–7.

To organise further opposition to the infidel, the Pope had recourse to other means also. Hearing of the victories gained over the Moors by Alfonso III., the brave and learned king of the Asturias and Leon, or of the Gallicias, as John calls him, he begged that monarch to send him, along with arms, some first-class Arab horses.[2] Evidently John had in mind to form a body of light cavalry suitable for coping with an enemy whose main strength was in rapidity of movement. At the same time he sent letter after letter to Boso, who had been left in Italy as his representative by Charles the Bald, imploring him so to attack the Saracens that they may not be able to get an opportunity to recover.[3] Energetic action, he writes, is all the more necessary, as he has received reliable information that the enemy are about to despatch a fleet of a hundred sail, including fifteen large vessels carrying horses, to assail the city.[4] Boso could not or would not furnish the desired help; and John had to appeal (November) to the emperor and empress directly.[5] "Were all the leaves of the forest turned to tongues," he writes to the emperor, "they could not tell of all the troubles we

[1] It may be that 'det' and not 'dat' is the correct reading here.

[2] "Aliquantos utiles et optimos Mauriscos cum armis, quos Hispani, cavallos Alpharaces vocant, ad nos dirigere non omittatis." Ep. 19. A Spanish chronicler of this period enumerates among the famous products of Spain 'caballus de Mauris.' *Chron. Albeldense*, written 883; ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 1126.

[3] Ep. 25, September 1, 876. *Cf.* Ep. 29.

[4] Ep. 30.

[5] Epp. 43-4 to the emperor, and Ep. 45 to Richildis.

are suffering at the hands of the Saracens. . . . Cities, walled towns and villages, bereft of their inhabitants, have sunk into ruin. Their bishops have been driven hither and thither. The thresholds of the Princes of the Apostles are the only places they have to turn to for refuge, as their houses have become the dens of wild beasts. Homeless wanderers, no longer have they to preach but to beg. . . . In distress, rather in ruin, is the mistress of nations, the Queen of cities, the Mother of Churches. . . . In the year that has passed we sowed the seed, but did not gather in the harvest. This year, as we have not planted we have not even a hope of reaping. But why do we speak of the infidels when Christians do no better? We allude especially to those on our borders whom you are wont to call margraves or marquises (*marchiones*). . . . You must come and help the Church, which, setting aside for you a good and great brother, freely chose you as another David for the imperial sceptre.[1] . . . If this Church is brought low, not only will the glory of your empire totter, but the greatest loss will accrue to the Christian faith." It is the cry of Gregory the Great over again. If the Lombards are bad, the exarchs are worse!

Still no help came. And so the Pope had not only to keep up his own heart, but to do his best to keep up the constancy of the loyal party. Guaifer, Landulf, and Aio, bishop of Beneventum and brother of Adelgisus, who was opposed to the traitorous conduct of his brother, had to be encouraged to struggle on. The close of 876 and the beginning of 877 saw several letters[2] despatched to them,

[1] Ep. 43. "Jube . . . . porrigere manum . . . . huic Ecclesiæ matri vestræ . . . . quæ in ultimo, spreto bono et magno fratre, vos more Dei gratuita voluntate, tanquam alterum regem David elegit . . . . ad imperialia sceptra provexit."

[2] Epp. 55, 56, 57.

urging them "to put their trust in God and not in the Sultan, or in Satan, as he might be more suitably styled."

Further letters (in February 877) to the emperor and empress let us see that matters have gone on getting worse. So bold have the Saracens grown that, in the night (*clandestinis horis*[1]), they have even come up to the walls of the city, sighs the Pope; and, after having laid waste the Campagna, they have even crossed the Teverone, formerly known as the Anio (Albula), and harried the Sabine territories. His heart has grown sick waiting for the imperial army so long promised but so late in coming. There is nothing left for it but the destruction of the city itself. By all that he (the Pope) did to secure him the empire,[2] Charles must act in defence of the Roman Church.

Further efforts to break up the Christian alliance with the infidel, 877.

At the same time John did not slacken in his efforts to detach the Christian states from the Saracen alliance, and to unite them in a common effort "to eliminate the impious race from our country."[3] With a view of impressing the others, John once more took in hand Sergius of Naples. He promised him, if he would abandon "the profane alliance," that he would give him in abundance of that wealth which he coveted; but assured him that if he would not give it up, he would not only excommunicate him afresh, with the sword of the spirit, but see to it that those who carried "not without cause material swords"[4] should attack him. The Pope's remonstrances at length produced an effect, if not on Sergius himself, at least on his people. They rose up against him, and elected his

[1] Ep. 60. [2] Ep. 58; *cf.* Epp. 59 and 62.

[3] Ep. 67. *Cf.* Epp. 63 (March 15), 68, and 69 (April 9). Without producing a scrap of evidence, Gregorovius pretends that the selfish conduct of these petty states is to be explained by their fearing that the Pope aimed at annexing them to his own dominions.

[4] Ep. 70.

brother Athanasius, the bishop, to be their duke. As for Sergius, "they put out his eyes and sent him to Rome, where he perished miserably."[1] In the letter in which the Pope congratulates "all the eminent judges" and the people of Naples for electing Athanasius and for rejecting Sergius, "who wrought more evil in Naples and in our territories than all his predecessors," he tells them that at present he has no more money at his disposal, but that at the beginning of Lent or on Easter Sunday he will send them 1400 mancuses.[2] For John was in the habit of generously subsidising the states which were true to the cause of Christianity. But he was soon to find to his cost that Athanasius was little better than his brother.

We may here again emphasise the fact that, while John was writing or talking to envoys, he was also acting. Besides building ships, fighting at sea, and rearing cavalry horses, he added to the fortifications in connection with the city. The isolated position of St. Paul's, on the high-road from Ostia to Rome, naturally exposed it to the danger of being again plundered by the Saracens. It had in course of time become the centre "of a considerable group of Johannipolis.

[1] Erchempert, c. 39. "Quo etiam anathemate multatus idem Sergius, non multo post a proprio germano captus est, et Roman mittitur suffosis oculis; . . . . ipse autem frater ejus in loco illius se ipsum principem instituit." The part here assigned in this rebellion to Athanasius is by the Pope assigned to the people themselves. *Cf.* Epp. 96–97. It is worth noting that the above quotation from Erchempert is cited by Gregorovius (iii. 183, n. 2) as though from the letter of the Pope to Athanasius! He remarks: "The murderer (Athanasius) was rewarded with a stipulated sum of money, and praised by letter." But the money, which, as we have seen in the text, would have been sent to *Sergius* had he thrown over the Saracens, was sent to the Neapolitans as an encouragement to induce them to be firm against the common foe. For after assuring them that he will send them the money, John adds: "Vos . . . . adversus infideles et communes inimicos totis viribus pro defensione Eccles. Dei desudare satagite." Ep. 97.

[2] A mancus of silver was worth half-a-crown.

buildings, especially of monasteries and convents. There were also chapels, baths, fountains, hostelries, porticoes, cemeteries, orchards, farmhouses, stables, and mills." In the cloister of the present monastery of St. Paul's are still preserved a few fragments of an inscription which, copied first by the famous tribune Rienzi and then by Sabino, tells us all we know of the works executed by John VIII. for the preservation of the basilica and its dependencies. It was apparently after his naval victory off Cape Circe (877) that the triumphant Pope (Johannes *ovans*) surrounded the *Burgh of St. Paul*, as it came to be afterwards called, by a wall, protected it by a fortress, which was still in good condition at the close of the eleventh century, and gave the whole enclosure the name of Johannipolis. The castle was of the utmost importance, as "it commanded the roads from Ostia, Laurentum, and Ardea—those, namely, from which the (Saracen) pirates could most easily approach the city. It commanded also the water-way by the Tiber, and the tow-paths on each of its banks." Unfortunately, it had disappeared before the beginning of the fifteenth century. Lanciani, who tells us that he has often examined the site of Johannipolis, has not found any certain remains of it; but he believes "that the wall which encloses the garden of the monastery on the south side runs on the same lines as John's defences, and rests on their foundations." And in 1890 he saw on the river-side "what appeared to be a landing-stage."[1]

[1] *Pagan and Christian Rome*, p. 153 ff.; *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, p. 84 f. The inscription spoken of in the text was in seven distichs, and was above the gate facing Rome. Part of it ran as follows :—

"In porta Burgi basilicæ Sancti Pauli
Hic murus salvator adest, invictaque Porta
. . . . . .
Quam præsul Domini patravit rite Joannes,

From about the year 875 a new power had been making itself felt in South Italy; or, rather, an old power had been once more there reviving its influence. Greek fleets of no little strength had appeared in Italian waters, testifying thereby to the fresh vigour which Basil the Macedonian was infusing into Byzantine administration. As the Franks had failed, the Lombards of Apulia appealed for help against the Saracens to the Byzantine governor of Otranto. Having obtained possession of Bari (875), the Greeks gradually conquered (875–94) most of South Italy, Beneventum included. To help to drive out the Saracens furnished them with an excuse to interfere in its affairs, and the dissensions of its various states supplied them with an easy means to subdue it. Their entry into Bari may be said to mark the beginning of the rule of the Greeks in South Italy, as its fall (1071) marks the close of their two centuries of possession of it.

The Pope appeals to the Greeks, April 877.

Feeling that the death of Louis made it incumbent on him "to work more than anybody else,"[1] and declaring that he would "decline no toil nor pain of body that he could at all endure," John endeavoured to procure from the Greeks help against the infidels who were again threatening his territories. On the arrival of the Greek fleet off the coast of the Duchy of Beneventum (*in partibus Beneventanorum*), he wrote to its commander to send him

> Qui nitidis fulsit moribus ac meritis,
> Præsulis octavi de nomine facta Joannis
> Ecce Joannipolis Urbs veneranda cluit, etc.
>
> Ap. Muratori, *Dissert.* 26.

[1] "Plus omnibus necessario laboramus, nullum laborem nullamque tolerabilem molestiam corporis recusabimus, quo minus adjuvante Domino pro tantis necessitatibus pro vobis cum præveniente Christo laborem nostrum viriliter insistamus," etc. Ep. 72, to bishop Aio of Beneventum. *Cf.* Gay, *L'Italie mérid.*, who notes that after 875 the force of circumstances compelled John to take an independent stand, and to recommence the fight against the Saracens.

"at least ten good swift war-ships to our harbour (*Portus*), to clear our coasts from those thieving and piratical Arabs."[1]

Congress at Traetto, June 877.

Without delaying to see whether his request would be granted by the Greeks, the Pope wrote[2] (April 28) to arrange for a congress to be held at Traetto between Athanasius of Naples, Landulf, the prince bishop of Capua, Guaifer of Salerno, Pulchar of Amalfi and himself, to arrange for the dissolving of the Saracen league. The congress met in June,[3] and an agreement was come to, by which in return for a payment of 10,000 mancuses from the Pope, the people of Amalfi were to guard the coast from Traetto to Civita Vecchia. But once more was John betrayed. When the money had been paid, Amalfi did nothing. It was 12,000 not 10,000 mancuses which had been promised, was their excuse.[4]

Charles the Bald comes to John's help, and dies, 877.

All this while John had not ceased to urge on the emperor, Charles the Bald, the necessity of his coming to crush the Saracens. In the last letter[5] which he addressed to that monarch (May 25, 877), he assures him that, as the whole of the Campagna had been devastated, there was no means by which sustenance could be procured "for the venerable monasteries, the Roman senate, or for ourselves." The arrival in Italy of Charles the Bald, which, as we have seen, ended in his death, proved more disastrous to the Pope than his absence.

[1] "Ut vel decem bona et expedita chelandia ad portum nostrum transmittas, ad littora nostra de illis furibus et piratis Arabibus exporganda." Ep. 73; *cf.* 72; both of April 17, 877. The *chelandia* had two banks of oars, with from 100 to 250 oarsmen; carried the terrible Greek Fire, and were equipped with a wooden tower, *xylokastron*. They served as frigates to the dromons. *Cf.* Guglielmotti, i. p. 125.

[2] Epp. 77, 78; 85. [3] Ep. 87.

[4] Ep. 99–100. *Cf.* Ep. 250, 3. In the second letter the Pope lets the Amalfitans know that if they do not restore his money, "our dromons" will have something to *say* to them. *Cf.* 288.

[5] Ep. 69.

When fear of the emperor had been removed by death, Lambert of Spoleto showed himself in his true colours, and harassed the Pope so severely that, unable to cope with the Saracens and Spoleto at once, nothing was left for him but to buy[1] off the infidel and to fly from the perfidious Christian. John goes to France, 878.

On his return to Rome (879), after failing to find an emperor, John discovered that the political situation in South Italy was anything but improved. During his absence, the hold of the Saracens in Sicily had increased by their capture of Syracuse (May 878); so that they were more at liberty to send fresh bands of freebooters into Italy. And, unfortunately, many of the miserable petty princes there were as anxious for the infidels to come as they were themselves to go. The death of Landulf, prince-bishop of Capua (March 879), resulted in his principality being divided between his four nephews. Naturally they were soon at war with one another, and got help from Greeks, Saracens, and the neighbouring princes. Two other relatives disputed the episcopal succession.[2] One of them, Landulf, had been elected on the demise of his uncle; and the other, Landenulf, had been consecrated by the Pope to oblige the count of Capua. This, Erchempert tells us, John did against the earnest expostulations of certain holy men, who assured him that if he ordained Landenulf he would light a fire which would reach even to himself. "And such a fire was lighted that all the duchy of Beneventum and all the territory of Rome were utterly laid waste by the Saracens,"[3] adds the monk. He had the best of all reason to know what he was talking about; for in the course of these Capuan struggles he experienced in his own person some of Returns to greater troubles, 879.

[1] Ep. 117, to Carloman. He had to pay 25,000 mancuses yearly.

[2] *Cf.* Erchempert, c. 40; *Chron. S. Bened.*, c. 19; and *Catal. Comitum Capuæ*, p. 499, all ap. *M. G. SS. Lang.*

[3] Erch., c. 47.

the troubles of which they were the cause. "I was taken prisoner, robbed of all the property I had gathered together from my youth, and on foot driven before their horses' heads as an exile to Capua, August 881."[1]

Perhaps the chief cause of all this misery and anarchy in S. Italy was Athanasius, the prince-bishop of Naples. He not only entered into a compact with the infidels, but actually furnished them with a place of refuge between the so-called "Portus Aequoreus" and the walls of his city. Thus were they enabled with impunity "to harry and plunder the territories of Beneventum, Rome, and Spoleto, their monasteries and churches their cities, towns, and villages, and their mountains, hills, and islands. Among countless other monasteries which they destroyed, they burnt that most noble one of St. Benedict, revered throughout the world (883), and that of St. Vincent on the Vulturno."[2] Various strong centres also did the Saracens form for themselves in mountain fastnesses to be able to lay waste the wretched country with impunity. Such were Sepino (thirty-six miles north of Beneventum) among the Apennines, and the encampment they formed on the banks of the Garigliano, near Minturnæ, or Traetto, sprung from its ruins, which commanded the high-road (via Appia) from Rome to Capua.

John's efforts to restore order.

Into this seething vortex, in the forlorn endeavour to produce even the semblance of order, the heroic pontiff plunged with a vigour that fast-approaching death could not subdue. If for a little time, racked with pain and wearied out with his journey to *France*,[3] he contented himself with writing letters of consolation to the afflicted,[4]

[1] *Ib.*, c. 44.

[2] Erchemp., c. 44.

[3] Ep. 207, to Pandenulf of Capua. "Quamvis et de assidua corporis incommoditate et de peracto jam Franciæ itinere adhuc maneamus defessi."

[4] Epp. 194–6, 201–3, 207.

and making promises therein to come and bring them aid, it was only that after a brief rest he might work the harder. And if during these last three years of his life, as in former years, he continued to write letters for help to the different Frankish kings, to the emperor Charles the Fat, and to the Greek emperor, it was only that he might leave nothing undone in his efforts to stem the ever-advancing anarchy in Italy. Despite the difficulties he had to face at his own door from Saracens and from the dukes of Spoleto, John did not hesitate to leave Rome and travel from one end of Italy to the other to promote the interests of peace. About August (879) he was at Ravenna; in October, at Gaeta; a few months after at Capua, whither he went again in 881 or 882; and in February (882) again at Ravenna. And, as the contemporary historian of South Italy, Erchempert,[1] informs us, he sometimes had the misfortune of having to witness day after day fierce fights between the Lombard rulers, helped, not to their advantage but to their destruction, by designing Greeks on the one hand and Saracens on the other. He exhausted in the good cause every means at his disposal. He wrote letters, despatched legates, organised congresses of the different hostile rulers, gave away large sums in subsidies, and freely used his power of excommunication. The affairs of Capua,[2] and especially the unpatriotic conduct of the prince-bishop Athanasius of Naples, occupied his attention very considerably. In treating with the latter he displayed a singular moderation. It was not till he was utterly weary[3] of the bishop's broken promises to dissolve his league with the Saracens, that he at length made known[4] (April 881) to the bishops of South Italy that he had

[1] C. 47. [2] Epp. 249–252, 258–9.
[3] *Cf.* his letters to Athanasius, Epp. 201–3, 273, 287, 318.
[4] Ep. 321, April 881.

excommunicated him. In his letter to them on the matter, he reminded them of the way in which, with the aid of his hateful allies, the bishop had so ravaged the country that he had quite cleared it of inhabitants; that, not sparing himself, he (the Pope) had gone to Naples to exhort him to give up his infamous conduct, and had given him large sums of money for the same purpose. Athanasius had over and over again promised to abandon the Saracen alliance; but, through greed of the share of their booty which he received from them, he had invariably broken his engagements. Hence had he excommunicated him, "as the enemy of all Christendom," till such times as he should completely sever all connection with the Saracens.

Some successes gained by John.

Occasionally, indeed, some consolation was afforded to the Pope by seeing success attend his efforts. Thus a victory gained by the Greek commanders, "Gregory the spatharius, Theophylactus the turmarch, and count Diogenes,"[1] over the Saracens at Naples (879 or 880), was followed by the arrival in papal waters of certain warships, sent by the emperor Basil, to render permanent help to the Pope "for the defence of[2] the territory of S. Peter." And before he died he had the satisfaction of seeing Athanasius repentant and suing for absolution from the excommunication. This John granted on condition[3] not only that he would break with the Saracens, but that he would deliver up their chief men to him and put the others to the edge of the sword. The character[4] of the warfare waged by these robbers more than justifies the

[1] Ep. 286.

[2] Ep. 296, to the Greek emperors (August 13, 880). "Gratias agimus . . . . quod dromones vestros, qui pro defensione terre S. Petri in nostro manerent servitio, nobis misistis."

[3] Ep. 352.

[4] *Cf.* the eye-witness Auxilius on their doings in his *Libell. in def. Stephani* (*Neap.*) *Ep.*, c. 2, ap. Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius*, pp. 97–8. Auxilius, though a Frank, lived at Naples.

Pope's requirements in their regard. To cope effectually with the savage African pirates we are speaking of, needed a man of the strength of will of Pope John VIII., who, as a modern historian correctly observes, "was the last of those able pontiffs of the ninth century who did their best to defend Italy from the infidel."[1]

His every-day work.

Whilst all the important events above rehearsed were in progress, John's register shows what was otherwise certain *a priori*, viz., that many another matter, of greater or less importance, occupied his mind at the same time. It shows him issuing decisions on matrimonial[2] cases of various kinds; confirming the privileges of monasteries[3] or churches[4]; granting palliums[5] to various bishops; transferring[6] bishops from one See to another; restraining them from unduly interfering with monasteries,[7] or with the election[8] rights of others; defending Church property[9] and the weak[10] generally; imposing canonical[11] penances on the one hand, and, on the other, deciding that those "who fall in battle, bravely fighting against pagans and infidels for the defence of the Holy Church of God, and for the good of Christendom, and who fall in the piety of the Catholic religion, obtain an indulgence of their sins and will be received into the rest of eternal life."[12] It is interesting to find, from another of John's letters, that the bishops had

[1] *Europe* (476–918), p. 462, by Oman, who, as has been noted above, has given special attention to this little-known chapter in history.

[2] *E.g.* Epp. 4, 190, 226, 232, 345. [3] Epp. 12, 13, 16, 33, 86, 89, etc.
[4] Epp. 90. 157 f. [5] Epp. 94, 123, 153. [6] Epp. 35–37, 64.
[7] Epp. 74–6, 238. [8] Ep. 101. [9] Ep. 102.
[10] Ep. 281. [11] Epp. 10, 191.

[12] The Pope had been asked by the bishops of the kingdom of Louis whether those who fell in battle for the Church and Christendom "*indulgentiam* possint consequi delictorum." John concludes the letter, part of which has been quoted in the text, thus: "Nostra præfatos mediocritate, intercessione b. Petri Ap., cujus potestas ligandi atque solvendi est in cœlo et in terra, quantum fas est, absolvimus." Ep. 186, ad an. 879.

then, as now, to see to the sending of the holy chrism[1] to the churches of their dioceses every year; and from yet another[2] that there could be no such thing as prescription where there was question of the spiritual rights of the Roman Church, and that, by imperial Roman law, it took a hundred years before prescription could prevail against its property. However out of the multitude of affairs which took up a less share of the Pope's time than those which have already been treated of at more or less length, there are some which, from one cause or another, deserve to be particularly noticed. Of these, some may be grouped together as relating to certain of the great bishops of the Christian world.

Peter of Grado.

Enough has already been said of the intercourse between the Pope and the patriarch of Constantinople, and, through him, with the Oriental patriarchs. Apart from that, John's register only shows him in direct contact with Theodosius, patriarch of Jerusalem. To him the Pope sends[3] presents, regretting that, oppressed by the infidels, he cannot send more, and begs his prayers. More is known of John and the patriarchal See of Grado. On the death of Senator, bishop of Torcello (875), there was elected to succeed him one Dominicus, abbot of the monastery of St. Stephen of Altino. Torcello, it may be noted, was the island to which the inhabitants of the mainland of Altino, etc., retreated from before the ravages of the barbarians of the North. Thither, to escape from the Arian Lombards, about the year 640 fled Paul, bishop of Altino, with the treasures of his old cathedral and with his people.[4] There he fixed his See, and there, as many think, are we to recognise Venice in its infancy. Although supported by the Duke Ursus, Dominicus could not prevail upon Peter,

[1] Ep. 271. [2] Ep. 5. [3] Ep. 213, May 2, 879.
[4] So at least says Dandolo in *Chron.*, ii. c. 7., n. 11.

"the worthy patriarch"[1] of Grado, to consecrate him, as in making a eunuch of himself he had incurred a canonical *irregularity* which was a bar to the reception of orders. Unable, however, to resist the Duke, who was determined to have his favourite consecrated, Peter managed to make his escape to Rome, and laid his case before the Pope (876). John at once took the matter in hand, and summoned to Rome, to have the matter thoroughly investigated in a synod, not only Dominicus himself, but the bishops of Equilio (Peter) and Malamocco (Felix), partisans of Dominicus, and various others. Trusting to the support of Ursus, Dominicus paid no heed to the summons, Felix declared that he was too ill to come, and Peter that he had been commissioned by the Duke (or Doge) to go on an embassy to Constantinople. On this the Pope wrote[2] (November 24, 876) to the Doge, as to one who had ever shown himself a friend, "because we cannot prefer the love of any man to justice," urging him to see that if Felix could not come to Rome he should at least send a representative; and that, if Peter had not started on the embassy, he should certainly come, as it was so much for the common good that the matter should be promptly settled. By letters[3] of a few days later, Felix and Peter were severely blamed for the want of respect they had displayed to their patriarch, and they were ordered, as was also Dominicus, under pain of excommunication, to come to Rome, in person or by deputy, before February 13. The Doge was asked[4] to defray the expenses of their journey; the bishops of Olivolo and[5] Caorle were requested to do their work for them in their absence, and bishop Deltus was commissioned[6] to proceed to Venice as the Pope's legate, and

[1] *Cf.* on this affair John the Deacon, *Chron. Venet.*, ed. Monticolo, pp. 121–7; Dandolo, *ib.* viii. 5, n. 20.

[2] Ep. 48. [3] Ep. 49–53, all of December 1.

[4] Ep. 51. [5] Ep. 52. [6] Ep. 53.

arrange for the carrying out of these directions. Ursus, however, refused to receive John's envoy, and that, too, as the Pope afterwards observed to him, "though the words we addressed to you were those of fatherly admonition and not those of one ill-disposed towards you."[1] In the letter from which the words just quoted were taken, John tells the Doge that, passing over his previous conduct, he wishes to let him know that he is going to hold a synod of all the bishops of Italy at Ravenna in the summer, and that it is his will that the bishops of 'Venice by the sea' should be present at it, as well as the Doge himself, if possible. With the Pope, Peter went to the council at Ravenna (August 877). Not even at this council was the affair of Dominicus settled. The bishops of Venice arrived only when the council was over. The Pope in anger excommunicated them; but soon after, at the intercession of Ursus, removed the excommunication from them. Whilst the Pope was in the north of Italy, the patriarch remained with him. But when the death of the emperor Charles the Bald, for whose coming the council of Ravenna had been a sort of preparation, compelled John to return to Rome, a compromise was arrived at between the patriarch and the Duke. Dominicus was to receive the revenues of the Church of Torcello, but was not to be consecrated during the lifetime of the patriarch. Peter survived his reconciliation with the Doge but a very short time.[2]

The archbishops of Ravenna.

Seeing the trouble that John, also the Eighth, archbishop of Ravenna, gave to Nicholas I., it is not to be wondered at that the present Pope also had differences with him, and had to be severe with him for attempting to appropriate[3] what belonged to the Roman Church. However, the two

[1] Ep. 82, May 27, 877. *Cf.* Ep. 83, to the bishops themselves; and Ep. 88.

[2] *Chron. Ven.*, pp. 124-5.

[3] Ep. 3, January 29, 874; Balan, pp. 9, 10.

remained very friendly; and, on the death of the archbishop, John was deeply grieved, and bade[1] the people of Ravenna and their new archbishop to pray for him. Romanus, like so many of his predecessors, soon[2] began to show that he wished to follow the example of the other clerical and lay lords of the period, and to do as he pleased; so that, while supporting him against his enemies, the Pope had to blame him for "non-residence" in his diocese. As time went on, John had more complaints to make against him. He was oppressing certain of the nobility of Ravenna,[3] disobeying the Pope, and generally acting in a lawless and unecclesiastical manner. He must come and clear himself before a council in September (881).[4] Romanus, however, did not come, and was duly excommunicated. The people of Ravenna were commanded[5] to abstain from holding intercourse with him. However, from letters[6] of the following August to and concerning Romanus, it would appear that, though the archbishop is in fresh trouble, he had, at least, been absolved from the excommunication, as he is addressed as "most holy." From three of these letters it may be gathered that at this period Romanus had fallen completely under the influence of a wicked cleric, one Maimbert of Bologna. The clergy of Ravenna had already complained bitterly to the Pope of what they had to suffer at the hands of Maimbert; but they had lacked the courage to act with the legate whom John had sent to arrange for his expulsion. However, once again "moved by their entreaties," he not only sent another legate, but commissioned his representative or 'missus' at Ravenna, and four other dukes,[7] to seize Maimbert and send him to

[1] Epp. 176–7, ad an. 878. [2] Ep. 199.
[3] Epp. 322, 3, 4, 5, July 881. [4] Ep. 327.
[5] Ep. 329, October 4, 881. [6] August 28, 882; Epp. 361–4.
[7] Ep. 364. "Joanni duci delicioso fideli seu et misso nostro." Ep. 363 is addressed to the four "glorious dukes."

Rome. The clergy are commanded to co-operate with Duke John and with the Pope's legate. If the four dukes and the clergy do not carry out John's orders, they will be required, as a penance, to abstain from wine and cooked food (*a vino et cocto*), and the four dukes will have to pay a fine of a hundred aurei apiece, and the clerics will be suspended from the exercise of their spiritual functions. What was the end of this affair is not known. The Pope himself died within a few months after the despatch of this letter.

Were it calculated to throw any further light either on the history of the times, or on the character of the Pope, many another[1] example of episcopal insubordination could be adduced from John's register. But from what has already been said, it is abundantly evident that that submission which is necessary for order was rapidly becoming, in Italy especially, a thing of the past as well in the ecclesiastical as in the civil régime. This further breaking to pieces of the new Roman empire, helped indeed by the blows of the barbarians from without, was a general and natural reaction of the Teutonic idea of individual freedom against that which the Germans regarded as its opposite, the all-absorbing rights of an imperial state. Such a movement—a movement, moreover, necessary before a new fabric could rise from the ruins of the old—could not be checked by the efforts of one man, however powerful. And the material resources of John VIII. were anything but extensive.

John and (i.) Spain.

Although the materials for the subject are not abundant, in addition to what has been already said indirectly on the matter, a few facts, illustrating John's position and action with regard to certain parts of Europe, which will

[1] *E.g.*, that of Anspert of Milan, who was only brought to submission after John had ordered the election of another archbishop in his place. *Cf.* Epp. 171, 212, 255, 310, 312, etc. *Cf. Invectiva in Romam*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 835.

hereafter develop into the countries of our time, may, perhaps not without advantage, be here grouped together. The victories over the Moors of the brave and learned Alfonso III., called the Great, naturally attracted the attention of the Pope, himself engaged in daily struggles against the same foes. At the earnest request of the king, John constituted Oviedo the metropolitan Church of his kingdom; confirmed to it all the property which king or subject might duly make over to it; and exhorted all to be properly submissive to it.[1] He also told the king to have the magnificent church, which he had erected round "the modest chapel" erected by Alfonso the Chaste in honour of St. James the Great,[2] patron of the country, consecrated by the Spanish bishops, and bade him hold a council with them,[3] no doubt on the organisation of the Church in the newly conquered districts. Sampiro, who was bishop of Astorga in 1035, and who wrote an important chronicle,[4] tells us that Alfonso was rejoiced at the sight of the papal letters, and that, with his bishops, nobles, and a huge crowd (*turba immodica*), he assisted first at the consecration of the basilica of St. James, and then some months later at the synod of Oviedo, which was celebrated

[1] Ep. 18.

[2] It was during the reign of Alfonso II. the Chaste (791–842), that were discovered at Compostella the remains of St. James the apostle, called the Greater. See Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, July 25.

[3] Ep. 19. We have it on the authority of the *Chron. Albeldense*, which was written in the year (883), that "ab hoc principe omnia templa Domini restaurantur." Ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 1139.

[4] Ap. Florez, *Esp. Sagr.*, xiv. It extends from 866–942, and is a continuation of the work of Sebastian of Salamanca. It was interpolated by its continuator Pelayo, *el Fabulero* (bishop of Oviedo, † *c.* 1155). Florez prints his insertions in italics. Our quotation from Sampiro is taken from Fuente (Append. 34 in vol. iii. of his *Hist. Eccles.*), who says that it is part of Pelayo's interpolation. *Cf. H. E.*, iii. 137, n. 1. Fuente rejects both the letters of John VIII.; but certainly many of the arguments on which he relies are of no weight, and have not been accepted by Jaffé, 3035–6 (2263–4).

"by the authority of the lord Pope John, and by the advice (*consilio*) of Charles, 'the great prince'"—*i.e.*, of course, the emperor Charles the Bald, and not Charlemagne, as some who would discredit this passage have imagined.

John also added, in a spirit of wise moderation, to the laws of the Spaniards. At the council which he held at Troyes (August 878), a copy of the code of the laws of the Goths was laid before him, in which, while there was no law to be found in it against the sacrilegious, it was clearly laid down that no judgment could be passed on matters which were not treated of in the code. Hence in Spain and Gothia the rights of the Church were often set at naught. The archbishop of Narbonne accordingly begged the Pope to put an end to this objectionable state of things. Accordingly, in an encyclical addressed to the "bishops and counts of the provinces of Spain and Gothia, and to all the Catholic people of the West," John proclaimed that by the law of Justinian sacrilege had to be atoned for by a payment of "five pounds of the finest gold"; but that he decreed that the milder regulation of Charlemagne was to be enforced. By that law sacrilege had to be compounded by a fine of "30 pounds of assayed (*examinati*) silver, *i.e.* by the sum of 600 solidi of the purest silver"[1]—an important passage as showing the relation then existing between the silver solidus and a pound of silver. Whoever, guilty of sacrilege, did not pay this fine, was to be excommunicated till he did. The decree was to be added to the code of Gothic law.

(ii.) England.

Despite "his ceaseless efforts in Western and Eastern Europe," John *did find* "the leisure"[2] to "occupy himself

[1] Ep. 150. "In xxx. libras examinati argenti—*i.e.* sexcentorum solidorum summam argenti purissimi." The coins mentioned in John's correspondence are the 'aureus,' the 'byzanteus,' the mancus and the silver solidus.

[2] "The perilous effects of the ambition of Rome," writes Dr Pauli

in the affairs of Britain." He found leisure to bestow on others, suffering like himself, that sympathy of which he stood in so much need himself, but which he had ever to be extending to others. In England the ravages of the Danes were causing the greatest distress, and "there was warfare and sorrow all this time over England," says our old chronicle (ad an. 870). In 874 or 875 they drove Burhred (Burgræd), king of Mercia, over sea. In his misery he naturally betook himself to Rome, but he did not, however, survive his exile long. "His body lies in St. Mary's Church, at the English school."[1] And whither kings turned for comfort, so also did priests. John received a letter from Edred (or Ethelred), archbishop of Canterbury, in which that prelate details the sufferings he had to endure at the hands of the Danes and of the king (Alfred), and seeks advice in his difficulties. This we know from the letter of John to the archbishop, a letter which we shall quote at length, as it sheds no little light on certain theories prevalent in this country on the former authority of the Pope in England. John begins his reply to the archbishop by observing that Edred's letters show his devotion to the Holy See, "since after

(*Life of Alfred the Great*, Eng. ed., p. 145), "had frequently been felt in many continental countries. But she found it more difficult to extend her power in that distant island, where but little progress had been made by the Romish canons in opposition to the national elements, etc. . . . No Pope of the ninth century professed that absolute power in England which had long been exercised by Rome in other countries. Even a John VIII. appears to have had neither the leisure nor the wish, owing to his ceaseless efforts in Western and Eastern Europe, to occupy himself in the affairs of Britain," etc., etc. This style of historical writing, very popular with a certain class of writers, no doubt does away with the necessity for laborious research. How far, however, in this case it represents anything but the imagination of its author, the text will show.

[1] *Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 874; *Cf.* Asser's *Life of Alfred*, ad an. 874.

the *manner of your predecessors* you are anxious to refer all the important affairs of your Church to us as to your teacher, and to seek the advice and the protection of the *authority* of the Apostolic See (in which God has placed the foundation of the whole Church) concerning the troubles which you suffer."[1] Truly has the whole world gone wrong. The Pope has to bewail the sorrows of the archbishop and his own as well. But he exhorts Edred to oppose himself like a wall of brass against all evil-doers, including the king himself; and tells him that he has written to the king to urge him to show his archbishop that obedience which his ancestors have done. In connection with certain matrimonial abuses of which Edred had written to the Pope, John proceeds to affirm that divorce cannot be allowed. He concludes his letter by confirming the privileges of the See of Canterbury.[2] The king here alluded to is no other than that glory of the Anglo-Saxon kings, Alfred the Great, who was not always the model he afterwards became. Even Asser[3] has to write of him: "In the beginning of his reign, when he was a youth . . . . he would not listen to the petitions which his subjects made to him for help in their necessities, or for relief from those who oppressed them; but he repulsed them from him. . . . . This particular gave much annoyance to the holy man St. Neot, who was

[1] Ep. 95, p. 745, ad an. 877. "Cum more antecessorum vestrorum et causas vestræ Ecclesiæ necessarias nostro præsulatui, quasi suo doctori referre, et a sede apostolica super quibusdam suis quas patitur adversitatibus consultum, et auctoritatis munimen accipere quæsistis, in qua Deus omnipotens totius Ecclesiæ posuit fundamentum."

[2] "Nos namque sedis tuæ privilegium . . . . illibatum tibi volumus procul dubio conservare, et ut ab omnibus ordinibus . . . . custodiatur in perpetuum . . . . sancimus atque præcipimus," *ib.* This letter, it may be remarked, is quite on the lines of those preserved by William of Malmesbury (*De Gest. Pont.*, l. i.), from previous popes to Edred's predecessors, and concerning the authenticity of which doubts have been expressed by certain writers. *Cf.* vol. i., pt. 1, p. 272, etc., of this work.

[3] In his *Life* of Alfred, sub an. 878. Bohn's translation is here used.

his relation, and often foretold to him,[1] in the spirit of prophecy, that he would suffer great adversity on this account; but Alfred neither attended to the reproof of the man of God, nor listened to his true prediction. Wherefore seeing that a man's sins must be corrected either in this world or the next, the true and righteous judge was willing that his sin should not go unpunished in this world, to the end that he might be spared in the world to come. From this cause, therefore, the aforesaid Alfred often fell into such great misery, that sometimes none of his subjects knew where he was or what had become of him." It was, doubtless, one or more of these youthful acts of tyranny which caused Edred to appeal to Rome, and drew from John an answer which shows his supreme spiritual authority in this country.

Francia.

Of John's relations with the Church on the other side of the Channel much has already been said in the course of the foregoing narrative. We may add here that after naming (876) Ansegisus of Sens his vicar "in the kingdom of the Gauls," John reverted to the ancient custom and appointed[2] (878) Rostaing of Arles his vicar. And through that archbishop he endeavoured, like his predecessor S. Gregory I., to make headway against the vice of simony,[3] which seems to have been as rife in Gaul in the ninth century as in the seventh.

Italy.

Naturally enough we have more evidence of John's watchful care over Italy. Apart from his unceasing efforts to save it from the Saracens, his *register* shows that he was ever occupied with its affairs. To note an instance or two. In Æmilia, near Modena, stood the famous monastery of

[1] *Cf. Vita S. Notti*, ap. Mabillon, *Acta S.S. O. S. B.*, Sæc. iv. vol. ii.

[2] *Cf.* Epp. 123–4.

[3] *Ib. Cf.* Ep. 159 to the bishops of Brittany that they should obey the archbishop of Tours; Epp. 160, 47, 101, etc.

Nonantula, founded in 752 on land which, from a wilderness, its founder St. Anselm had converted into a paradise. Acting on what seemed to be fast becoming the only recognised principle of action, viz. that might was right, Adelard, bishop of Verona, appears to have disdainfully set at naught the papal privileges bestowed on the monastery, and, in seizing its revenues, not to have hesitated to reduce the monks to the greatest destitution. It required excommunication[2] to bring Adelard to a sense of his misdeeds.

Next it is for the forcible carrying off of another man's wife that John charges[3] the bishop of Pavia to excommunicate certain powerful men. Then abbot Anastasius is bidden to restore the *cellula* of St. Valentine, situated in the *Sabine territory* (in Sabinis), which he has taken from bishop Gaudericus.[4] At *Carpi* John[5] watches over the restoration of a church destroyed by fire. The bishops of *Chieti* and others are[6] instructed to see to it that a certain widow be not bound to keep religious vows extorted from her by force. These instances will serve to show that all matters, great or small, in this part of Italy or in that, received a share of John's watchful attention. And in order that, while he was engaged in attending to affairs at a distance, those at home might not be neglected, he published a series of regulations[7] which the cardinals were to follow in looking after ecclesiastical discipline in Rome. They were to meet at least twice a month in some church or deaconry, and were to examine into their own way of living—their dress, comportment, and the like—and into that of the lower ranks of the clergy. They were to look into the manner in which the prelates treated their

[1] "Venerabilis Anselmus suique monachi propriis manibus laborantes, de sentibus et de deserto ad perfectionis culmen perduxerunt." *In vit. S. Anselm.*, ap. *M. G. SS. Langob.*, p. 567. *Cf.* p. 570.

[2] Epp. 74–6. April, 877. [3] Ep. 184. [4] Ep. 237.

[5] Epp. 271, 9. [6] Ep. 272. [7] Ep. 346.

inferiors and the inferiors obeyed their superiors. They had to put down abuses, and settle the cases of both laymen and clerics that belonged[1] to the papal court. They had also to look after the monasteries during the time that they were without abbots. For the settlement of other matters concerning the clergy or the laity they had to meet twice a week in the Lateran, according to the decree of Leo IV. This decree is doubtless the one made by Leo, when he was leaving Rome for Ravenna (853), in which he laid it down that in his absence both ecclesiastical and civil affairs were to be transacted as usual. On the appointed days, as though he were there in person, all the nobles had to betake themselves to the Lateran and administer justice to those who sought it.[2] From these two decrees, it is clear that the Lateran palace was the centre of papal administration in the ninth century; and in the Lateran palace itself we find the *Hall of the She-wolf*—the hall where stood the bronze she-wolf now in the museum of the Capitol—especially noted[3] as a hall of justice. For a satisfactory exposition of the last clause of the constitution, which relates seemingly to the seven hebdomadary cardinal bishops spoken of above, we must refer to some antiquary.[4] The clause runs: "Concerning our dioceses (*de parochiis*), we decree that you possess them in perpetuity; that you celebrate the divine office in the chief churches in turn according to the priority of your consecration; and that (saving the ancient rights of the cardinal deacons) you share equally

[1] Querimoniæ definiendæ "quæ ad nostrum judicium pertinent." *Ib.*

[2] "Præcipimus ut in nostra absentia nec ecclesiasticus nec palatinus ordo deficiat; sed constitutis diebus tanquam si nos hic fuissemus omnes nobiles ad Lateranense palatium recurrant, et quærentibus ac petentibus legem ac justitiam faciant." Jaffé, 2633.

[3] *Libell. de imp. potest.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 964. Duchesne, *L. P.*, ii. 139.

[4] *Cf.* vol. i., pt. ii., p. 391 of this work.

their offerings as well for your own use as for the lights of your churches.[1]

Death of the Pope, 882.

Still hard at work, John was overtaken by death, December 16, 882. Regarding the details of his death, we have a dreadful account in the Ratisbon continuation of the Annals of Fulda—"if the solitary statement of an historian (*distant*, he might have added), is to be trusted," says Gregorovius.[2] In conspiracy with a number of others who desired the Pope's treasure and his position (*nudum episcopatus*), one of his relations administered poison to him; but finding that the poison worked slowly, put an end to the pontiff's life by striking him with a hammer. And, then terrified at the hostile demeanour of the crowd, the murderer fell dead without anybody touching him. In refusing to accept this sensational story one will probably not be setting aside the known truth. Peter Mallius, before giving part of John's epitaph, says that his tomb was situated near the *porta Judicii* in front of the Church of St. Peter. The epitaph runs:—

Præsulis octavi requiescunt membra Joannis
Tegmine sub gelido marmorei tumuli.
Moribus ut paret fulsit, qui mente beatus
Altisonis comptus actibus et meritis
Judicii custos mansit, pietatis amator,
Dogmatis et varii plurima verba docens.
De segete Christi pepulit zizania sepe
Multaque per mundum semina fudit ovans.
Docti (loquus), prudens, verbo linguaque peritus,

[1] Ep. 346.

[2] *Rome*, iii. 204. Lapôtre rejects the details of the story, which are not only assigned by their narrator to the wrong year (883), but are overlaid with the marvellous as the narrative quoted in the text shows. The continuation of the same annals by Meginhard and the other authorities simply record the death of John without any details. The two continuations are to be read, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. pp. 397–8; or in the later ed. of the Annals of Fulda, by Kurzen (1891). If the story is correct, John VIII. is the first Pope who has died by the hands of an assassin.

[3] Ap. Duchesne, *L. P.*, ii. 223.

Sollertem sese omnibus exhibuit.
Et nunc celicolas cernat super astra falanges. . . .

"Beneath this cold marble rest the mortal remains of Pope John VIII., a man who was adorned with the highest qualities of head and heart. He guarded justice, loved virtue, and taught the truth. He uprooted the cockle and sowed the good seed. Eloquent, prudent, and learned, he excelled in everything. His home is now with the angels beyond the stars."

Promis gives us copies of five coins of John VIII. Coins. Besides the name of the Pope, *Luddovicus Imp.* appears on two of them; one struck during the vacancy of the empire is, of course, without an imperial name; *Karolus Imp.* (Charles the Fat) figures on the fourth; and the fifth, bearing the letters *Cap.*, was struck at Capua by Bishop Landenolf.

Now in possession of the facts of John's life, the reader will be able to decide for himself whether the charges of cruelty and the rest, so freely brought against John by writers who it would seem are either following their prejudices, or else the blind guidance of ill-informed authors, are well founded. It may be emphatically affirmed that they are not. The character of John VIII. stands out well under the full glare of the search-light of history. It is a character well worthy of our admiration. If historians of all shades of opinion agree in praising the character of S. Gregory the Great, no valid reason can be given for withholding a fair meed of praise for the character of John VIII., who in very similar circumstances displayed a very similar character. In the midst of daily ill-health and sorrows, which between them did not allow[1] him a moment's rest, which deprived him of his sleep,[2] and only left him the grave to hope[3] for, he never lost heart and never lessened his energetic efforts for good. His whole endeavour was to inspire[4] others with the courage which was aflame

Character of John VIII.

[1] Ep. 195. [2] Ep. 79.
[3] Ep. 57. *Cf.* Epp. 71, 104, etc. [4] Ep. 29.

in his own breast, worn out, indeed, with years, but vigorous from the unconquerable soul that dwelt within it. Like Gregory, he was essentially a Roman. He may, indeed, be regarded as the last of the Roman Popes. To understand how fully he was animated with the spirit of the old rulers of the world, we must note the way in which he ever speaks of Rome—to him always the queen and capital of the civilised world—and the pride with which he pronounces the names "Roman, Senate of Rome, and *gens togata*."[1] John's Roman character displayed itself not only in his untiring energy, but in his practical adaptation of means to the end he had in view, and in his iron will. If John was convinced that something had to be done, which was in itself good, he strained every nerve to accomplish that end. And if at times he may have worked a little roughly, what wonder when the character of the times in which he lived is taken into consideration. But he was not, for all that, devoid of feeling for others. We find him begging mercy for a murderer,[2] exerting himself to suppress the slave traffic in captives snatched by the Greeks from the infidel,[3] and reproving[4] Bertar, abbot of Monte Cassino, for rashly judging John's illustrious predecessor Hadrian II.—telling him it would be much better for him to give up abstaining from flesh meat, than to go on eating away the characters of men. And that John was not devoid of artistic feeling we may perhaps presume from the fact of his ordering an organ[5] from Germany. In his command of money, too, John resembled Gregory. He was one of those men who, combining a diligent attention to his income with a well-regulated expenditure of it, always seem to have money to spare for

[1] Lapôtre, p. 276, who, as always, supports what he asserts with copious references.

[2] Epp. 39-40.

[3] Ep. 50, ap. Lowen.

[4] Ep. 45, *ib.*

[5] Ep. 1.

useful objects. His sound business-like methods inspired confidence, and of themselves tended to bring him money.

It would, of course, be a mistake to suppose that, even broadly speaking, the character of John VIII. was on a par with that of Gregory the Great. In the former there was more of the rough warrior, the astute statesman, and, perchance, of the partisan leader than of the peaceful priest, the gentle scholar and the absolutely impartial judge. And if the epithet of *largus* (munificent) applied to John VIII. by his namesake the Deacon is certainly equally applicable to Gregory, the title of Saint, which East and West alike have bestowed on the latter, has never yet been given to John VIII. But, in estimating the character of John, it must never be forgotten that the enemy he had to contend against was a cruel, barbaric, and infidel pirate, that the Italian nobles of the ninth century were much more lawless than those of the sixth—and, in this respect, were on the down grade—and that he had a kingdom of his own to defend against the encroachments of the ferocious Saracen and of the licentious Christian Duke.

Much less would be said against the political actions of the earlier medieval Popes by certain modern writers, if they would not bring their modern ideas of *national* politics to their study of the simple politics of the early Middle Ages. The idea of a united nation in a suitable geographical area was never contemplated by the men of the ninth century. The *imperial* idea was indeed entertained by churchmen, who were acquainted with the history of Rome, and who had ever before their eyes the Universal Church—and especially, as was natural, by the Popes of Rome. But if it was grasped and accepted by such a barbarian (non-Roman) layman as Charlemagne, it was by a natural reaction rejected by the great mass of the barbarians who settled in the western parts of the Roman empire.

Freedom *from all restraint for himself* was the only idea tolerated by the free German; he was a stranger to either imperial or even national ideas for many a long century. The politics, then, of the ninth century were not of an elevated or complicated order. The attempt to make the Teutonic barbarian conquerors move along the lines of the Roman empire proved a failure; and, at the period at which we have now reached, was ending in complete chaos. Out of the chaos will emerge the feudal system, "where[1] the bond of man to man replaces the civil bond, where the citizen is absorbed in the vassal, and the fief takes the place of country."

In bringing our sketch of John VIII. to a conclusion, it may be remarked with Doellinger[2] that, if John "more frequently than any of his predecessors, pronounced sentence of excommunication against bishops and powerful laics, (it) must be ascribed to the prevailing depravity of the age, and to that state of hard necessity to which the See of Rome was then reduced." The excommunications pronounced by John were just, and often brought order where nothing else would. The age in which he lived was unworthy of him, but could appreciate[3] him. It was reserved for moderns to discover in him faults which escaped the notice of those who knew him.

[1] Lapôtre, p. 280.

[2] *Church Hist.*, iii. p. 133, Eng. trans.

[3] In addition to the contemporary evidence as to the character of John, *cf.* Auxilius, *Libell. in Def. Steph. Neap. Ep.*, c. 2, ap. Dümmler, p. 98.

MARINUS I.

A.D. 882–884.

Sources.—They are anything but abundant. We have the *Catalogue*; the *Annals*, especially the continuations of the Annals of Fulda; Frodoard; a few incidental notices in the polemical writings of Auxilius and Vulgarius, who wrote during the reign of Sergius III., and of whom more will be said under the *Life* of Formosus, etc. An inconsiderable number of his letters, etc. have been published in different collections—three of them, ap. *P. L.*, t. 126.

Emperor of the East.	Emperors of the West.
Basil I. (The Macedonian), 867–886.	Louis II., 850–875.
	Charles II. (The Bald), 875–877.
	Charles III. (The Fat), 881–888.

Early career.

In Marinus, John VIII. had a worthy successor. A native of Gallese (a town in the Roman Duchy which commanded the road from Rome to Ravenna by Todi and Perugia), and the son of the priest Palumbo, he entered the service of the Roman Church at the early age of twelve, as we learn from his own words recorded in the fourth session of the Eighth General Council. Ordained subdeacon by Leo IV., he was attached to the Church of S. Maria ad Præsepe, and in 860 was present as a subdeacon when Pope Nicholas received the envoys of Photius and the

emperor. Ordained deacon (862–66), he [illegible] last-named year on that embassy to Constantinople [illegible] the imperial officials stopped on the Bulgarian [illegible] the empire. Three years later he was [illegible] Hadrian II. to preside, as his third legate, at the [illegible] General Council. He enjoyed the full confidence [illegible] John VIII., as he had of his two predecessors, and was much honoured by that discerning pontiff. He made him bishop of Cære[1] (Cervetri), treasurer[2] (arcarius) of the Holy See, and archdeacon. Among the many commissions entrusted to the courageous ability of Marinus by John VIII. (880) was the one to the Emperor Basil which resulted for the legate in an honourable imprisonment. In 882 we find him at Naples on a diplomatic mission to its bishop, Athanasius.

Election of Marinus.

After such a record of a well-spent life, it is not surprising that, immediately (December 16[3]) on the death of John, the unanimous[4] voice of the Roman people, though acting against the canons which forbade translations from See to See, called Bishop Marinus to the papal throne. He seems to have been consecrated immediately without any waiting for the consent of the emperor. But it was not to a bed of roses that he had been called. Faction troubles, which

[1] It has been sometimes denied that the Marinus who became Pope had been a bishop. The controversial writings of Atenulus and Vulgarius, however, place the matter beyond doubt: *Cf.* Vulgarius, ap. Dümmler, pp. 128, 131, etc.; the author (Vulgarius?) of the [illegible] *in Rom.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 830; the Annals of Fulda, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 397.

[2] *Cf.* Ep. 260, Joan. VIII. In that letter John tells Charles the Fat that he is sending him as an envoy—"Marinum venerabilem episcopum et arcarium sedis nostræ."

[3] Following the chronology of Duchesne. We are now reaching a period when the greatest uncertainty prevails as to the exact dates of the accession and demise of the Popes.

[4] *Ann. Fuld.*, ad an. 883, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. p. 398. "Marinus, [illegible] episcopus, contra statuta canonum subrogatus est."

the strong hand of John had kept down, began at once. And the Annals of Fulda assign even to this very year the murder of the rich *superista* Gregory, "by his colleague, in the precincts (*in paradiso*) of St. Peter's." The murderers did not hesitate to drag the dead body through the church, staining its pavement with the blood of their victim. Lapôtre believes[1] this Gregory to have been that relation of John VIII. who is said to have put an end to his life by the blow of a mallet; and that his (Gregory's) marvellous death recorded by the Ratisbon continuation of the Annals of Fulda, is no other than this assassination described by Meginhard. Further, the contents of a note, which is added to the name of Hadrian III.[2] in a catalogue, to the effect that he caused George of the Aventine to be blinded, and the widow of the above-named Gregory to be whipped, are also by some authors connected with this event. But in all this finely-woven connected story there is too great a preponderance of the merest conjecture.

Marinus meets the emperor, 883.

The emperor, Charles the Fat, from whom Marinus might naturally have looked for support, only made the condition of the empire worse than he found it. He came into Italy after Easter, and spent the whole summer there. And while, unable to keep his own counts from fighting with their armed followers under his very eyes, in attempting to do what it would have required a powerful, strong-minded ruler to accomplish, "he excited against him the feelings of the Italian nobles."[3] For in an assembly at Verona, he dispossessed, as far as words went, Guy, or Guido, 'Count of Tuscany,' and others of their fiefs (*beneficia*), which their ancestors had held before them for

[1] Lapôtre, *Le Pape Jean*, p. 162. *Cf. supra*, p. 348.

[2] The papal catalogue in the *Chron. S. Bened.*, ap. *M. G. SS. Lang.*, p. 483.

[3] *Ann. Fuld.*, ad an. 883.

generations, and gave them to men of low degree. Headed by Guy, the affronted nobles flew to arms, and, so far from losing their fiefs, "seized much more than they had held before," laconically adds Meginhard.[1] Moving south to meet the Pope, Charles received him with becoming honour at the monastery of Nonantula, where they remained together on June 20, consulting on the needs of the empire.[2] Guy, who had meanwhile allied himself with a powerful body of Saracens, and was terrorising the whole country, was here declared guilty of high treason. Berenger of Friuli was deputed to strip him of his fief by force. A campaign successfully begun by him was brought to an ignominious termination by the usual fever. Even the emperor was stricken with it, and had to withdraw from Italy, leaving that country in greater confusion than it was before he set foot within it. To no purpose was it decreed (next year) that the Bavarians should march against Guy. Before the year (884) had run its course, Charles was compelled to make peace with the outraged Italians.[3] With such an emperor, no wonder that Marinus could effect nothing in the way of bringing order into the country.

Absolves Formosus.

In one respect, at any rate, Marinus reversed the policy of his predecessor, rather unfortunately as the sequel proved. He absolved Formosus from the sworn promises he had made to John, and restored him to his bishopric.[4] Formosus was certainly very different in character from George of the Aventine and the other leaders of the party

[1] *Ib.* As Umbria, in which Spoleto is situated, is by some ancient writers included in Tuscany, Guido is here called 'Count of Tuscany,' instead of the more familiar 'Count of Spoleto.'

[2] *Cf.* a diploma of Charles, ap. Jaffé, 2615.

[3] *Ann. Fuld.*, ad an. 884.

[4] "Notum est," says Vulgarius ap. Dümmler, p. 135, "a Marino primum episcopo, dein summo pontifice . . . . fuisse absolutum, receptum et in pristino honore revocatum." *Cf.* Auxilius, *De Causa For. P., Inf. et Def.*, c. 32, p. 1101; and the author of the *Invect.*, p. 831.

with which he had become involved. He was rather weak than wicked. And it is not unlikely that it was because John VIII. saw that Formosus might easily become the tool of designing men—or that, at least, the faction, which had secured his interest, might cloak their nefarious plans under the good name of the Bishop of Porto—that he forbade him to come to Rome again. It is quite possible, also, that John was wholly mistaken in his estimate of the character or guilt of Formosus. But it is plain, at any rate, that the latter must have become closely identified with one faction which was at a bitter feud with another, if we are to judge only from the brutal manner in which even his dead body was treated under Stephen (VI.) VII. The simple fact that he had left his See of Porto for that of Rome is not enough to account for the animosity with which he was pursued even after death. But of all this, more will be said when the reign of Stephen VII. is treated of. It is sufficient to observe here that Marinus would have been well advised if he had left Formosus in exile. Great scandal would have been avoided if he had trusted to the wisdom and justice of his predecessor.

Condemns Photius.

If, however, Marinus deviated from the policy of John in the case of Formosus, he did not with regard to Photius. He had stood by at the Eighth General Council and seen that heresiarch ape the conduct of Our Lord before Pilate; he had suffered thirty days' imprisonment on his account, and had personal knowledge of the man he was dealing with, and, following the example of his predecessors, he condemned[1] him. Hence the attack made upon him by Photius. Unfortunately the letter which, at the dictation[2]

[1] See the inscription taken from the right of the portico of S. Sophia. *Cf. supr.*, p. 272 n.

[2] Pope Stephen VI., in his answer to this letter (ap. Labbe viii. 1391, or ix., p. 366), plainly insinuates the hand of Photius. "Ille, quidem, qui adversus sanctissimum Marinum sacras aures tuas contumeliis

of the latter, the emperor Basil sent to Hadrian II. [illegible]. Its contents are only known through the [illegible] by Hadrian's successor, Stephen (V.) VI. [illegible] Photius, urged *inter alia* that Marinus had been [illegible] before his election as Pope, and hence could not [illegible] ferred from one See to the other. Such a [illegible] with very good grace from Photius, who had translated many of his own friends from one See to another. Stephen, however, whose letter will be given more in full under his *Life*, had no difficulty in showing, from [illegible] which he adduced, that translations had often been made for a good and sufficient cause. And he maintained that the character of Marinus, Our Lord's "immaculate priest," was reason enough for his translation. The breach between Rome and Constantinople, which, at any rate, had not increased under John VIII., was rapidly widened under his immediate successors.

Fulk of Rheims.

Frodoard,[1] who, in harmony with the epitaph of Marinus, praises his wisdom and his zeal and success in overcoming the errors of the Greeks and restoring unity to the Church, has preserved [2] for us some knowledge of his relations with France. In response to the profession of faith which he received from the deservedly famous Fulk, archbishop of Rheims, Marinus sent him the pallium. Further correspondence passed between them. Besides asking the Pope to confirm the privileges of the Church of Rheims, and to interest himself in the young king Carloman, who, along with Fulk himself, had visited Rome with his father, the emperor Charles the Bald, the archbishop begged him to take cognisance of the action of Erminfrid. This man had

maculavit, adversus D. N. J. C. . . . . blasphemias effutire [illegible] non dubitavit, etc. Decipitur profecto quicumque putat, quod discipulus sit supra magistrum."

[1] Ap. Watterich, i. 650.

[2] In his history of the Church of Rheims. *Hist. Rem.*, iv. 1.

seized on a monastery belonging to Fulk, but which was situated in the diocese of Eurard, archbishop of Sens. The Pope accordingly wrote to Eurard and to John, archbishop of Rouen, in whose diocese Erminfrid was then living. But of the issue of this affair we know nothing.

The same may almost be said of the rest of the work of Marinus. However, to pass over his confirmations of the privileges of a few monasteries, another little scrap of information regarding his actions should not remain unnoticed by an Englishman. Out "of regard for Alfred, king of the Anglo-Saxons, and at his request, (Marinus) freed the school (or quarter) of the Anglo-Saxons resident at Rome from all tribute and tax. He also sent many gifts on that occasion, among which was no small portion of the holy and venerable cross, on which Our Lord J. Christ was suspended for the general salvation of mankind."[1] And, on the other hand, we find it recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* that "that same year (883) Sighelm and Aethelstan carried to Rome the alms which the king (Alfred) had vowed to send thither." And there may now be seen in the Museo delle Terme, in Rome, a part, no doubt, of his "alms," viz. three silver coins of Alfred, which, together with many other somewhat later English coins, were found (1883–4), as we have already noticed, in an earthen vase on the site of the House of the Vestal Virgins. Marinus and King Alfred.

While the chroniclers give us the year of the death of Marinus, the month is a matter of conjecture. With Duchesne[2] and Pagi it may be assigned to May, and with Death of Marinus, 884.

[1] Asser's *Life of Alfred*, ad an. 884, and *Chron. Ethelwerd.*, an. 885. *Cf. Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 885, about "the good Pope Marinus."

[2] *L. P.*, ii. p. lxxv.; Jaffé, 3396 (2622). In some of the old chronicles, Marinus I. and II. were sometimes erroneously given as Martinus II. and III. Hence Martinus IV. (1281–5). In the one denarius of Marinus known to Promis, there is the peculiarity that *Roma* is linked

the former to the 15th. From the same author we cite the epitaph from Marinus's tomb, which was in St. Peter's "between the Silver Gate and the Roman Gate in the portico."

Quam sollers Domino placuit, qui mente modesta
Præsul apostolicus orbis et omne decus.
Hic statuit tumulo claudi sua membra sub isto
Hæc eadem sperans ut sibi reddat humus.
Ardua qui fulsit cunctis ut sidera cæli,
Augustis carus, gentibus et tribubus.
Doctrinis comptus, sacris et dogmate claro
Per patrias sancta semina fudit ovans.
Nam Graios superans Eois partibus unam
Schismata pellendo reddidit ecclesiam.
Principis hic Petri sed quisquis tendis ad aulam
Dic supplex isdem regnet ut arce poli.

Marinus, who with his humble mind pleased God and was an honour to the world, ordained that his members should be buried in this spot, in the hope that one day the earth would give them back to him. Shining like the stars in heaven, he was beloved by kings and peoples. Adorned with learning, he scattered abroad the good seed. Overcoming the Greeks, he banished schism from the East. Whoever you are who visit this temple of St. Peter, pray that he may reign in heaven.

with the Pope's name on the obverse, instead of "Scs. Petrus," which in this instance is associated with "Carolus Imp." on the reverse. This peculiarity is also to be noted on one of the coins of John VIII.

HADRIAN III.

A.D. 884–885.

Sources.—They are the same as for Marinus I. The place of Hadrian's death, etc., we learn from the monk of Nonantula, who to Hadrian III. fitted a life of Hadrian I. (*Cf.* under the *sources* for Hadrian I.) A few facts concerning Hadrian have been preserved in the life of his successor, Stephen (V.) VI., in the *L. P.*

Two letters, ap. *P. L.*, t. 126.

Emperor of the East.	Emperors of the West.
Basil I. (The Macedonian), 867–886.	Louis II., 850–875.
	Charles II. (The Bald), 875–877.
	Charles III. (The Fat), 881–888.

Election.

ACCORDING to the chronology, more or less probable but not certain, of Duchesne, Hadrian, a Roman[1] and the son of Benedict, became Pope, May 17, 884. Of what he did, however, either before or after he became Pope we know but little.

The party of Formosus.

He seems to have maintained an impartial but firm attitude towards the party of Roman nobles which had

[1] Gregorovius (*Rome*, iii. p. 206), confounding this Pope with Hadrian the father of Stephen VI., says that Hadrian III. was "of the Via Lata."

been proscribed by John VIII. For [illegible] notorious George of the Aventine, he retained [illegible] of the Holy See George's father-in-law, [illegible] figures as "missus" and "apocrisiarius [illegible] Apostolic[2] See," dignities he had enjoyed under [illegible]

He is also said to have caused Mary, the [illegible] widow of Gregory, the *superista*, who was murdered [illegible] paradise or atrium of St. Peter's, to be whipped [illegible] through all Rome."[1] We may conjecture that this [illegible] some disgraceful intrigue with that scoundrel [illegible] the Aventine. Although we are ignorant of the [illegible] these terrible events, still such horrible assassinations [illegible] barbarous punishments cannot fail to warn us that [illegible] entering on the darkest period of the history of the [illegible]

Photius. If full reliance could be placed upon the testimony of Photius, it might be concluded that Hadrian [illegible] amicable relations with that patriarch. "Hadrian," said, "sent us a synodical letter in accordance with [illegible] custom." Comparing this assertion with that of the [illegible] tion, previously cited, which states that Hadrian condemned Photius equally with Marinus and the rest, we may conclude that the truth probably is that Hadrian addressed a friendly letter to Constantinople to or about Photius with a view to bringing him to a sense of his duty. This failing, Hadrian renewed the condemnation passed on him by his predecessors.

Decrees (?) relative to the empire. Two decrees have been attributed to this Pope which have given rise to no little discussion. They are [illegible] quoted on the authority of Sigonius, a sixteenth-century writer who, on earlier Italian history, used to be a good deal more frequently cited than he is now. He was clearly

[1] *Chron. S. Bened.*, ap. *M. G. SS. Lang.*, p. 483. "[illegible] nudam per totam Romam fusticavit."

[2] Jaffé, second edition, 3401. [3] *Mystagog.*, c. 89; Jaffé, [illegible]

the belief that he had access to much earlier writers, whose works have been since lost. But there is little doubt that an authority often consulted by Carolus Sigonius was his own imagination, and that his style is much more admirable than his facts are reliable. The earliest testimony which can be adduced in support of these decrees is the uncritical[1] chronicle of the Dominican Martinus Polonus, who died in 1278. According, then, to Sigonius,[2] the Italian nobility, disgusted with the weakness and discords of the Carolingian sovereigns, and grieved at the destruction caused by the Saracens, went to the Pope and begged him to consult for the safety of the state. In consequence of this appeal Hadrian issued two decrees. One had in view the liberty of the Romans, and laid down that "the pontiff elect could be consecrated without waiting for the presence of the emperor or his ambassadors." The other, consulting for the dignity of Italy, decided that "if the emperor Charles died without male issue, the kingdom of Italy with the title of emperor should both be placed in the hands of the princes of Italy, who should confer them on one of their own number." The only points that can be urged in behalf of the authenticity of either of these decrees is that, as a matter of fact, Stephen VI. was consecrated without any information being sent to the emperor, and that some of the princes of Italy will soon be seen contending for the imperial crown. In fact, Lambert of Spoleto had already entertained the idea of making himself emperor. But the biography of John VIII. shows how little the princes of Italy cared either about the ravages of the Saracens, or about unity of any kind, imperial or regal.

Various deeds of Hadrian.

It only remains to note that Fulk of Rhelms continued

[1] *Cf.* on Martinus, *Early Chronicles of Europe—France*, p. 349, by G. Masson.

[2] *De regno Italiæ*, ad an. 884, l. v. p. 223-4.

his correspondence with Hadrian on the subject of the intruder Erminfrid, that the Pope ordered Sigibod of Narbonne to see that Girbert, bishop of Nîmes, ceased to annoy the monastery of St. Giles, and that, in a synod (April 17, 885), he took under his protection and confirmed the privileges of the monastery of S. Sixtus at Piacenza built by the empress Engelberga.[1]

The death of Hadrian.

The Annals of Fulda[2] tell us of the last acts of Hadrian. The emperor, Charles the Fat, now master of Gaul also, sent to invite the Pope to France, to attend a diet he was about to hold at Worms. Though we may conjecture that Charles wanted the Pope to come that he might consult with him on the state of the empire, nothing is known for certain on the matter. The annalist states that *rumour* had it that the emperor wanted to depose certain bishops without good cause (*irrationabiliter*) and to name his natural son, Bernhard, his heir. And because he suspected that he could not effect these measures by his own power, he hoped to accomplish them "by apostolic authority, as it were through the Pope. But these schemes were dissipated by the finger of God." For the Pope, after appointing "John the venerable bishop of Pavia and missus of the most excellent emperor Charles,"[3] to rule the city during his absence, fell ill on his journey to Worms, and died at a villa on the Panaro—which Stephen's biographer calls Viulzachara, afterwards S. Cesario, and the monk of Nonantula 'Lambert's thorn,' at any rate 'Spinum Lamberti' near Nonantula. The monk assigns July 8 as the date of the Pope's death; Duchesne, the middle of September. He was buried in the monastic Church of St. Silvester at Nonantula. Under the biography of Hadrian I. it has already been told how the monks afterwards opened the

[1] Jaffé, 3397, 3401 (2623, 2624).
[2] Ad an. 885.
[3] *Vit. Step. VI.*, in *L. P.*

Pope's tomb for the sake of his rich vestments, and how his chasuble was still to be seen at the monastery, when the anonymous monk unwittingly wrote about *two* Hadrians instead of one.

The tombs of the Popes.

With the exception of St. Martin I., whose remains were finally laid to rest in S. Martino ai Monti, Hadrian III. was the first Pope since the days of Gregory I. whose body was not buried in St. Peter's; and, indeed, he was one of the very few since the time of St. Leo I. who died out of Rome. In the days of persecution the tombs of the Popes were in the Catacombs. S. Melchiades, who died (†314) on the eve of the Church's freedom, was the last one to be interred therein.[1] At first they were buried around the body of St. Peter on the Vatican. This custom, which ceased with S. Zephyrinus (†218), was resumed after Constantine had given peace to the Church. And from St. Leo I. (†461) to the destruction of the old basilica of St. Peter in the sixteenth century, by far the greater number[2] of the Popes, some eighty-seven in all, were buried in its vestibule between the Porta Argentea and the south-west corner, occupied by the secretarium or sacristy.

During this period, the old Petrine-basilica period, "the pontifical graves were mostly ancient sarcophagi or bathing basins from the thermæ accompanied by an inscription in verse, and, as the Renaissance was approached, by canopies of Gothic or Romanesque style."[3] Whereas in the Catacomb period of papal interments, the simple *loculi* of the Popes were closed by a slab of marble marked only with their names, in what we may call the third or new-Petrine-basilica period, which reaches down to the

[1] "Hic sepultus est in cymiterio Calisti, in cripta." *L. P., in vit. Cf.* Duchesne, *ib.* i. p. 169, n. 5.

[2] After John X. (†928), the Lateran became the favourite burial-place of the Popes.

[3] Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, p. 214.

present day, the place in which they are now buried (S. Peter's) has been "transformed into a papal mausoleum which is worthy of being compared in refinement of art, in splendour of decoration, in richness of material, in historical interest, with the Pantheons of ancient Rome."[1]

Frodoard on Hadrian.

Passing over what Frodoard, in his *History of the Church of Rheims*, repeats about Fulk, its archbishop, we may quote as an epitaph of Hadrian—as no real epitaph of his is forthcoming—what that author sings of him elsewhere. From these verses we learn that Hadrian adopted, or authorised the adoption of,[2] as his spiritual son, the king of France, Carloman (†December 12, 884), and was a kind father to his fellow-bishops.

> Tertius emissos (=prædictos) Adrianus honore secutus,
> . . . . . .
> Nostrumque affectu regem genitoris adoptat (adoptet),
> Præsulibus patrem pandens se rite benignum.[3]

Coin.

The one coin, the usual silver denarius, that has come down to us of Hadrian, has his name and that of St. Peter on the obverse, and that of Carolus Imp. and Roma on the reverse.

[1] *Ib.* On this subject see also Barnes, *St. Peter in Rome*, p. 126; Gregorovius, *The Tombs of the Popes*, Eng. ed.; and Balan's review of the last-named work in his *Le Tombe dei Papi*, Modena, 1879; Duchesne, *Mélanges d'archéol. et d'hist.*, 1902, p. 404 ff.

[2] Fulk had written to him to commend Carloman to him—*Hist. Eccles. Rom.*, iv. c. 1. The subjects on which he wrote to Hadrian were the same as those on which he had previously written to Marinus. *Cf. supr.*, p. 358.

[3] Frod., *De Christi Triumph.*, l. xii. c. 4, ap. *P. L.*, t. 135.

STEPHEN (V.) VI.

A.D. 885–891.

Sources.—There has been preserved a considerable fragment of a contemporary life of this Pope in the *Liber Pontificalis*. It is the last biography in what may be called the first part of the *L. P.* (V. sup., p. 231).

Of Stephen's letters, etc., there are 33 ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 785 ff.; 1 *ib.*, p. 1021; 6 ap. Lowenfeld, *Epp. Pont. R. ined.*; and a few elsewhere.

The Annals as before. An unknown author, perhaps of Verona, composed (between 916–924) an historical poem on the struggle of Berengarius of Friuli for sovereignty. This production, entitled *Panegyricus Berengarii*, is of more merit as a tenth-century poem than of weight as an historical authority. It is to be found *M. G. SS.*, iv., or Muratori, *R. I. S.*, ii.

Emperors of the East.	Emperors of the West.
Basil the Macedonian, 867–886.	Charles III. (the Fat), 881–888.
Leo VI., the Wise, 886–912.	After the deposition of Charles in 887, various nominal or ephemeral emperors appear on the scene, of whom the first, Guy, formerly Duke of Spoleto, was crowned, February 21, 891.
	Guy, or Guido, 891–894.

Early life of Stephen

STEPHEN, the successor of Hadrian III., who was a Roman of the aristocratic quarter of the Via Lata, proved by his

conduct, as did his father Hadrian,[1] that his [illegible] as noble as his birth. His education was superintended by his relative, Zachary, "the most holy bishop" (of Anagni) and librarian[2] of the Apostolic See,[3] and the "simple-minded Job" of John, the deacon—a man who has often been to the fore, though not always in honour, in the preceding pages.[4] Hadrian II., perceiving the youth's piety and his earnest application to his studies, ordained him sub-deacon, and installed him in the Lateran palace. "When he had received this honour he led a wonderful life." In body chaste, in character kindly, in face cheerful, prudent, generous and talented, he showed himself the friend of the poor and the needy. Honoured by Hadrian, he was even more honoured by Marinus, who ordained him deacon and priest "of the title of the Quatuor Coronati" near the Lateran,[4] and lived in the very closest intimacy with him.

Election. At the time of the death of the successor of Marinus, the Romans were suffering from want occasioned by a plague of locusts and by the excessive dryness of the season. Convinced that Stephen's holiness would bring them relief from their troubles, they determined to make him Pope. Accordingly, when there had gathered together "the

[1] Duchesne (*L. P.*, p. 196), quoting Federici, *Storia dei Duchi di Gaeta*, p. 150, notes that Hadrian was still alive in 916. His name (Adrianus, genitor domni Stephani Papæ) appears among those of a number of Roman nobles who signed the treaty of alliance between John X. and the princes of Southern Italy.

[2] It is not unlikely that he succeeded Anastasius. At any rate, he held the office on March 29, 879. Jaffé, 3230.

[3] But see Lapôtre, *Le 'souper' de Jean Diacre*, p. 335 ff. A letter of Stephen (ap. *Spicileg. Cas.*, i. 381) seems to prove that Zachary was still alive when his relative was made Pope; for Stephen gave a commission "nostro fideli episcopo Zachariæ"—presumably to Zachary of Anagni.

[4] Direct from the *L. P.* *Cf.* the author of *Invect. in Rom.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 832.

bishops[1] and the clergy, the senators and the nobles, the people, and a crowd of both sexes, they unanimously declared that they wanted Stephen to be their bishop." Proceeding at once, along with John, bishop of Pavia and imperial *missus*, to the house of Stephen, they burst open the doors, and hurried him off to his titular Church. It was to no purpose that both father and son (for they were found together) protested they were unworthy of the honour which the people wished to bestow upon them. From the Quatuor Coronati they escorted Stephen to the Lateran palace to receive the homage of the higher clergy and nobility. The heavy rain which fell whilst the Pope-elect was being conducted to the Lateran seemed to the people to be the harbinger of happier times. Without waiting for the imperial consent, Stephen was consecrated on the following Sunday by Formosus.[2] Powerful where no resistance was possible, Charles the Fat determined to depose the new Pope, as his consecration had taken place without his consent. He accordingly despatched his arch-chancellor, Liutward, bishop of Vercelli, and certain bishops of the Roman See to carry out his will. Their mission, however, they were unable to accomplish. Stephen was too firmly seated in the affections of the people. And he pacified the emperor by showing him, from the *election decree* which he forwarded to him, with what unanimity he had been elected and consecrated. The decree had been signed by more than thirty bishops, all the cardinal priests and deacons, the minor clergy, and the principal laity.[3]

[1] *L. P.* "Facto conventu epporum: et totius clericalis ordinis, necnon nobilium senatuum et virorum illustrium cetu, una cum omni populo et utriusque sexus vulgi multitudine."

[2] *Invect. in Rom.*, pp. 826, 832—*i.e.* as bishop of Porto he took part in the consecration.

[3] *Ann. Fuld.*, ad an. 885. This Pope, who is called Stephen VI. in this work, is also called the sixth and not the fifth by Pope John IX. *Cf.* Jaffé, 3522 (2706).

The Pope finds the treasury of the Church empty.

With wondrous works, says his biographer, did the Pope at once begin to adorn his ministry. But it was no easier in the ninth than in the twentieth century to perform wondrous external works, at any rate, without money; and the *Book of the Popes* draws a melancholy picture of the condition of the pontifical treasury as Stephen found it on his accession. With his bishops, the imperial legate, and "the honourable senate," the Pope wandered through the palace examining all the places where the papal valuables ought to have been. But the treasures of the Pope, both sacred and profane, were conspicuous by their absence. Not only was most of the pontifical plate missing, but even the sacred vessels and ornaments of the altar, the gifts of the great, such as the first golden cross presented by Belisarius,[1] had disappeared. The papal cellars and granaries were also empty. Stephen took such a large company with him in his round of inspection that all might know in what state he had found everything.

It is usual to explain this disastrous condition of affairs with regard to the loss of the papal property, by pointing out that it was becoming quite customary to sack pontifical and episcopal residences on the death of their owners. Hence was issued the eleventh canon of the council held at Rome by John IX. in 898. This canon forbade the continuance of this "most detestable practice" under pain of civil and religious penalties.[2] It must not,

[1] Some authors, *e.g.* Gregorovius, deceived by a false reading of the *L. P.*, represent this cross as having escaped the depradators. (*Cf.* Duchesne, *L. P.* ii.—text, p. 192, and notes, p. 197.)

[2] It had already been frequently condemned by the civil authorities. *Cf.* a capitulary, c. 11, of Lothaire: "De deprædationibus quoque, quæ *moderno tempore* defunctis episcopis a diversis hominibus factæ sunt in rebus ecclesiasticis, ut, qui eas fecerunt, legaliter emendent cum emunitate nostra," *i.e.* 600 solidis. This was published by Lothaire in Italy in 832—ap. Bor., ii. 64.

however, be forgotten that the nomenclator Gregory had carried off "almost all the treasures of the Roman Church," and that Pope John VIII. wrote [1] to complain that he could not recover them. No doubt, to explain the complete want of everything experienced by Stephen, both causes must be allowed for. Feeling more than ever in need of money on account of the famine, Stephen turned [2] to his father, and succoured the needy with the wealth of his family. Stephen VI. was not the first Pope who used his ancestral wealth in the same way.

Efforts of the Pope to increase virtue.

The *Liber Pontificalis* goes on to inform us of the care taken by the Pope to have round his person men distinguished for learning and piety; of his personal care of orphans; of his entertaining the nobility with good cheer for soul and body at the same time; of his daily Mass and perpetual prayer, which he never interrupted save for the needs of his people; and of his having spiritual books read to him during his meals. To check the irreverence of the people in church by their unbridled talking, and to put a stop to the magical practices which he had heard were rife among them, Stephen often himself preached to the people during Mass. His biographer has preserved one of these sermons for us. It runs as follows:—[3]

A ninth century papal sermon.

"We have to admonish you, dearest children, that in assembling in the most sacred temple of God, you be mindful to diligently attend to that which brings you here. For if with lively faith you believe it to be the temple of God, that belief ought to be manifest by your deportment in it. Though the Lord is present everywhere,

[1] Ep. 42. *Cf. supra*, p. 284.

[2] *L. P.*, n. 7. "Conversus ad patrem, facultates quas incliti sui parentes possiderant abstulit, et larga dextra pro posse pauperibus erogavit," etc.

[3] *L. P.*, n. 8. The translation here used is taken from Miley's *Hist. of the Papal States*, ii. p. 218 ff., after comparison with the original.

He is in an especial manner present in His temple; there, it is His will that we resort to Him in prayer, and there His graces and mercies are poured out, not on the ungrateful, but on all who approach with piety, and in proportion to the fervour of each—as He has said: 'Many sins are forgiven her because she has loved much.' For the temple of God is the place of prayer, as He says in another place: 'My house is a house of prayer to all nations'; and the Psalmist: 'Sanctity, O Lord, becometh Thy house.' Now, if it be the house of prayer, it ought to be used as such—to pray, to chant the divine praises, to confess our sins, to cancel, by bitter tears and groans of contrition, our offences, and with firm hope to implore the forgiveness of our transgressions; because in the temple is found, in a special manner, the mercy-seat; there are, assisting the orders of angelic spirits, the choirs of the saints who present before the Lord of Hosts the vows of the people and the suffrages of the priest, when, at the altar, he supplicates for the faithful.

"With what face, therefore, can he dare to present himself in the most holy temple of the Almighty, who only comes to profane it by his garrulity and absurd fables? For if on the judgment day, an account shall be rendered for every idle word; how much more rigorously will not that judgment be exacted for such discourses, contumaciously carried on in the sight of so many saints, and in a place specially consecrated to God? With what hope of pardon for past transgressions can they approach the Almighty who come before Him only to add to their account by perpetrating new ones? Tremble at the chastisement of Him who with a scourge drove out those who bought and sold from the temple; for less guilty was their conduct, who there carried on a traffic of things in themselves useful, than is that of Christians who gratuitously insult the

divine presence by their absurd nonsensical garrulity and scandalous bandying of stories!

"When ye assemble in the place of prayer, remain in a recollected silence, the heart intent on entreaty to God, that the suffrages offered up for you by the priest, may be accepted by Him, and that his prayers may be heard—having ever in mind the admonition of our Lord: 'When you come to prayer, forgive those who may have offended you, that your heavenly Father may forgive you your offences.' Meditating such things as these through the inspirations of Divine grace, and being imbued with the doctrines of the apostles and evangelists, having first of all obtained mercy from the Almighty with the fruit of good works, like lamps illuminating the sanctuary round about, you will merit to be hereafter presented to Christ in the realms of joy, and to be there crowned in the company of the saints.

"For the rest, most dearly beloved, we wish you to be aware that the Lord in instituting the law for His people, as Moses testifies, enjoined this ordinance, saying: 'The sorcerer you shall not suffer to live' (Exod. xxii.). Now it grieves me to say that in this city there are some who not only do not reprehend, but who on the contrary encourage and patronize the abandoned persons, who dread not by abominable incantations to consult devils, regardless of the doctrine thundered in their ear by the apostle. What participation of light with darkness, or what agreement of Christ with Belial? For inasmuch as contemning Christ, they turn after the custom of the Gentiles to take counsel of demons, they by all means avow themselves not to be Christians. And how execrable, how impious it is, turning one's back on Christ to offer homage to demons, we leave you, beloved children, to ponder in your own breasts, that the thought of it may transfix you with horror.

"Wherefore, whosoever from henceforth shall be found to pollute himself with this pestilence, by judgment of the Holy Ghost, we pronounce an outcast from the vivifying Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and if any one shall be found to set these salutary admonitions at defiance —treating them with contempt, and incorrigibly persisting in his pestiferous enormity—let him be anathema for ever, from God the Father, and from His Son Jesus Christ."

Stephen's good works and reputation.

Not to disconnect our knowledge of this Pope derived from the man who knew him, it will be best to follow to the end what the *Book of the Popes* tells us of him. Whatever money he could procure he expended on the repair or adornment of churches, on ransoming such as had fallen into the hands of the Saracens, and on whatever was required for the public good. The fame of his virtues spread everywhere, and crowds flocked to him for his blessing from east and west.[1]

His zeal for the beauty of God's House.

Of all that Stephen accomplished for the external glory of the House of God, his biography only mentions a portion. And here only a selection of that portion will be made. In the case of the basilica of St. Peter,[2] Stephen not only made offerings to it of various ornaments, and issued decisions as to the services carried on within its walls, but confirmed a most important regulation regarding its use which had been made by Pope Marinus. It appears that a custom had grown up by which the authorities of the basilica exacted an annual charge from those "who there daily offered up the sacrifice to the Lord." This custom, condemned by Marinus, had again come into force under his successor. It was put a stop to by Stephen.

[1] *L. P.*, n. 9. "Cum fama sui nominis atque actuum tam per orientales, quam occidentales partes diffamaretur, pene omnes ad eum occurrebant ut ejus benedictionem perciperent."

[2] *L. P.*, *ib.* "Ubi sacro ipse corpore requiescit," the biographer is careful to add.

Not only was his own church of the 'Quatuor Coronati' endowed by Stephen with gifts of ecclesiastical ornaments of various kinds, and copies of the sacred Scriptures, but similar presents, especially of copies of parts of the Bible and of other good books, were made by him to churches in Ravenna, Imola, and other places—"for his one aim was to do what might please God."[1]

The locust plague.

He also turned his attention to the plague of locusts which had begun to devastate the papal territory in the days of Hadrian III., and was still continuing its destructive ravages. He tried both natural and supernatural remedies. He offered a reward of five or six *denarii* for every pint of locusts which was brought in to him. Though this resulted in considerable locust-catching activity, it did not affect the plague. When human means had been tried and found wanting, the Pope turned to God by prayer. We are told that he betook himself to the oratory[2] of Blessed Gregory (where was preserved the saint's couch), hard by St. Peter's, and that after he had spent no little time in tearful prayer, he blessed some holy water, gave it to the 'mansionarii,' and told them to give it to the people and to bid them sprinkle their fields with it, and implore the mercy of God. The united faith of pastor and people was rewarded. The locust plague ceased. With even this story left a little incomplete, the first part of the *Liber Pontificalis* comes to an abrupt close. We must look

[1] *Ib.*, n. 18.

[2] This oratory, situated at the right of the portico of the basilica, was already in existence in the eighth century, as is clear from the mention of it in what is known as the work of the *Anonymous of Einsiedeln*. This was the briefest of guides to the city of Rome, drawn up by some northern pilgrim (perhaps from the monastery of Reichenau) at the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century, and found by Mabillon in the monastery of Einsiedeln. *Cf.* Gregorovius, *Rome*, iii. p. 517. Most of it will be found in Miley, *Papal States*, i. p. 396 f.

elsewhere for further information about the [illegible] of Stephen VI.

Deposition of Charles the Fat, 887.

Stephen VI. had the misfortune of witnessing political events in the West which at least heralded that unhappy period for Italy and the Popes which we purpose to examine in another volume. In the forefront of those events was the deposition of Charles the Fat. Physical and intellectual decay brought it about that the Carolingian race ended as the Merovingian had already done, viz. in the deposition of its last representative who held any imperial sway.[1] With the widening of the territories over which Charles ought to have held sway, came a narrowing of his intellect. He grew daily stouter and more incompetent. Finding him in every way useless, he was deposed in the diet of Tribur (November 887) by his nobles, acting under the leadership of Arnulf, Duke of Carinthia, a natural son of Carloman, the late king of Bavaria. Charles did not survive his disgrace long. He died January 13, 888. Powerful nobles soon seized upon the chief portions of his empire. Arnulf, who had distinguished himself in campaigns against the advancing Slavs, was chosen king of Germany; and the west Franks, setting aside the child Charles the Simple, the posthumous or illegitimate[2] offspring of Louis the Stammerer, elected as their king the valiant Eudes, or Odo, Count of Paris, who had inflicted many a severe blow upon the Normans, and who thus became the first "Capetian" sovereign. It has been already noted that Boso had made himself king of Provence or Cisjurane Burgundy. Now (887), Rodolf, "chief of the rival family of the Welfs, equally allied to that of

[1] For yet a hundred years scions of the race retained the name but very little of the power of king in Northern France.

[2] It is not quite certain whether the mother of Charles was the lawful wife of Louis or not.

the Carolingians, caused himself to be recognised as king of Transjurane Burgundy—*regnum Jurense*—(Franche-Comté and Western Switzerland), with St. Maurice for his capital."[1]

Guido becomes king of Italy.

In Italy strife soon became vigorous between Berenger of Friuli and Guy or Guido III. of Spoleto for the crown of that country and for the imperial sceptre. From the time that the Frankish ancestors of Guido had, in the middle of the ninth century, been named dukes of Spoleto, they had gone on steadily strengthening their position. They made their duchy hereditary, and by marriage and diplomacy so extended their influence that Guido, the third of that name, felt that the time had now come to make himself king of Italy, if not emperor. If Berenger had the advantage of being allied with the Carolingian family, and of having had at least the name of king of Italy[2] from the very beginning of 888, Guido was near Rome, and, perhaps through the exertions of his relative Fulk, Hincmar's successor in the archbishopric of Rheims, had already (886) been adopted by the Pope "as his only son."[3] The north of Italy which so far, under the Carolingian rule, had enjoyed comparative peace, became now, like the south, the abode of war. After a considerable amount of fighting,[4] Guido, who had previously failed to seize the crown of the western Franks, gained the upper hand, and had himself proclaimed king of Italy in a diet held at Pavia at the end of the year 888, or in the beginning of 889.

[1] *Les Origines*, 395–1095, by Lavisse and Rambaud, i. p. 424.

[2] This is proved from his extant diplomas. *Cf.* Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 888.

[3] Frod., *Hist. Rem.*, iv. c. 1, pp. 412–5, ed. Lejeune, Reims, 1854; or ap. *M. G. SS.*, xiii. *Cf.* appendix for the Dukes of Spoleto of this period.

[4] *Ann. Fuld.*, 888; *Paneg. Bereng.* "Post bella horribilia cladesque nefandissimas," says the synod of Pavia, ap. Muratori, *R. I. S.*, ii. p. 1416; or *M. G. LL.*, ed. Boretius, ii. 104.

Diet of Pavia, 889.

Of the thirteen short decrees of the diet, the first two treat of "our mother the holy Roman Church." They lay down that her honour must be preserved. "For it is preposterous that the head of the whole Church, and the refuge of the weak should be harassed, especially as on her *healthy condition depends the well-being of all of us.*"[1] After passing other decrees regarding the freedom of the Church, the assembly elected Guido (Wido or Guy) to be "their king, lord (senior), and defender" as he had undertaken to exalt the holy Roman Church, to observe the laws of the Church, to frame just laws for his subjects, to extirpate rapine, and to promote peace (c. 12).

Guido emperor, 891.

Not content with being thus proclaimed king, Guido made use of his influence with the Pope to procure from him the coveted title of emperor. Crowned[2] by Stephen (February 21, 891), he proclaimed "the renovation of the empire of the Franks," though he was anything but master even of Italy. For with the good-will of Arnulf of Germany, Berenger still maintained himself in his duchy; and in south Italy, while the power of the Saracens was still unextinguished, that of the Greeks was making steady headway. The death of Pope Stephen, some six months after his coronation of Guido, meant the loss of another hope for the peace of Italy. The understanding which existed between Stephen and Guido would doubtless have worked well in the interest of the prosperity of Italy. Nor can what is stated in the Ratisbon[3] continuation of the

[1] The closing words of this decree, truer to-day for the well-being of Europe in the twentieth century than for that of Italy in the ninth, are worthy of being committed to memory: "*Praesertim cum sanitas ipsius* (S. R. E.) *nostrorum omnium est salubritas.*" Mansi, *ib.*, c. 1.

[2] *Annal. Vedast.*, ad an. 888; Muratori, *Annal.*, viii. p. 163 f.

[3] That is the fifth part of the *Annals*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. p. 407, ad an. 890. The letter of Stephen to Swatopluk (Ep. 13, p. 801 f.) re-

Annals of Fulda, under the year 890, be urged against the fact of this understanding. We there read that, in the Lent of 890, Arnulf of Germany went to Pannonia, and, at a place called Omuntesberch, held a diet with the Moravian duke, Swatopluk (or Zwentibold). There, influenced by the Pope, Swatopluk begged *Arnulf* to go to Rome, "the abode of St. Peter," and free "the Italian kingdom" from bad Christians and pagans. But pressing business in his own kingdom caused the king, though unwillingly, to decline the invitation. It is certain, however, as will be shown immediately, that what the Annals proceed to relate about Hermengard under this same year (890) really belongs to the preceding year; and as the Annals are here obviously chronologically inaccurate, it is generally believed that the invitation to Arnulf here spoken of refers to that sent him later on by Pope Formosus, who was on as good terms with him as Stephen had been with Guido. Indeed, in the manuscript used by Marquard Freher in the preparation of his edition of these Annals (1600), the name of the Pope was actually given as Formosus, at least in a gloss.[1] There seems, then, no reason to doubt of the harmony existing between Guido and Stephen.

Swatopluk receives a crown from the Pope.

It has been thought that this Swatopluk, of whose good-will towards Pope Stephen we have just seen an instance, received a crown from him. In Mansi's edition of the Councils there is a record of a council held "in the plain of Dalmatia" under a King Swatopluk. At the request of the king's envoys, a Pope Stephen sent to Dalmatia Honorius, "cardinal-vicar of the Holy Roman Church," to whom he gave full powers to act in his name.[2] The

garding the condemnation of the Slavonic liturgy has been cited above, p. 244.

[1] *Cf. Pertz*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. p. 407, note *e*, and p. 341.

[2] "Sicut moris est, quando per orbis partes legati a sede Romana mittuntur," say the Acts of the synod, ap. vol. xii. 723–4.

principal business of the synod, the proceedings of which were conducted both in Slavonic and Latin, was the coronation of the king by the cardinal legate. This translation has been referred to Stephen VI., in the first place, because of the good-will which existed between him and "King Zventopolco (Swatopluk)." And attention has already been called to the fact that Slav princes set the example of entrusting the patronage of their kingdoms to the sovereign pontiffs. Swatopluk was one of those princes. In the letter[1] (already quoted) of Stephen VI. to that prince condemning the use of the Slavonic tongue in the sacred liturgy, he praises the king because he chose the vicar of Blessed Peter "as his chief patron before all the princes of the world, and commended himself to the saint's guardianship (tuicioni)." In turn, Stephen promised ever to be his protector. Finally, in confirmation of all this, there is adduced the authority of Dandolo. Though a late, he is not an unreliable authority. He says[2]: "By the preaching of Blessed Cyril, Svethopolis, king of Dalmatia, with all his people, embraced the Catholic faith. And in the presence of the bishops of the true faith and of the apocrisiarii of the emperor Michæl, on whom he acknowledged that his kingdom depended, he was crowned on the plain of Dalmatia by Honorius, cardinal-legate of the Apostolic See."

There can be little doubt, however, that this papal coronation of a king of Dalmatia must be referred to a later date.[3] About the middle of the eleventh century, the

[1] Ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 801. *Cf. supra*, p. 244.

[2] *Chron.*, l. viii. c. 5, ap. *R. I. S.*, xii. p. 182. As the Emperor Michael died 867, it is needless to point out that his legates could not have been present at the synod. But *cf. infra* under the *life* of Pope Stephen X.

[3] For there is absolutely no reason for believing that Swatopluk, King or Duke of the Moravians, had any authority over Dalmatia; and the name of Swatopluk does not appear among those of the princes of Dalmatia.

Serb, Stephen Bogislav (Boistlav),[1] threw off the Byzantine yoke. His son, Michael,[2] became king of the Servians. This successful movement not unnaturally influenced the Slavs of the Adriatic. They also sought independence; and, to strengthen their position, turned to the Pope. It is to this period and to these political events that the council "in the plain of Dalmatia" must be referred. Knowledge of it has come down to us through the *Chronicle* of the Presbyter of Dioclea (Dukla), who wrote in the second half of the twelfth century, and is believed to be the earliest of the Croato-Dalmatian writers. Unfortunately his work is based on little more than popular tradition, and is full of anachronisms.[3] Still with regard to the incident with which we are dealing, it is more than curious that a Pope Stephen and an emperor Michael were contemporary. Stephen (IX.) X. became Pope on August 3, 1057; and Michael VI., Stratiotikos, only ceased to be emperor on August 31, 1057. It is certain, moreover, that Suinimirus (Zvonimir), King of Dalmatia, received a crown from Pope Gregory VII. not twenty years after.[4] If, then, in the present case, the Presbyter of Dioclea has been guilty of any mistakes, and that, it would seem, remains to be proved, he has assigned to Stephen IX., to Honorius and to Swatopluk, actions which he should have ascribed to

[1] He is thought to be the same man as Dobroslav. *Cf.* Ranke, *The History of Servia*, p. 5, Eng. ed., London, 1853.

[2] There is extant a letter of Gregory VII. to this king. Ep. v. 12. *Cf.* Fabre, *Le liber Censuum*, p. 140 ff.; Pypine and Spasovic, *Hist. des litt. Slaves*, 197; Finlay, *The Byzantine Empire*, 512.

[3] The *chronicle* has only survived in the Latin translation of Marko Maruli († *c.* 1524). *Cf.* Pypine, *l.c.*, 246; Morfill, *Slavonic Literature*, pp. 146, 22.

[4] *Cf.* Ep. Greg., vii. 4, condemning a noble for opposing "eum, quem in Dalmatia regem auctoritas apostolica constituit." See his oath taken before the legates of the Pope "in sinodo habita in Dalmatia," ap. Fabre, *l. c.*, 356.

Gregory VII., to Gebizo, and to Zvonimir. All that relates, however, to the early history of Slavonic Dalmatia is wrapped in obscurity; and, in English works at any rate, it is very difficult to obtain any information on the subject at all.[1]

Efforts of Hermengard in behalf of her son, Louis the Blind.

Boso, whose usurpation of the kingdom of Provence (or Arles or Burgundy)[2] was so strongly condemned by John VIII., died January 11, 887, leaving his son Louis a minor. But the reins of government were held firmly for him by his mother, Hermengard. She exerted herself to obtain from Pope Stephen what Boso had failed to obtain from John VIII., viz. that the new kingdom of Provence should be recognised by the Pope. A similar request was preferred by her to Arnulf of Germany, who seems to have claimed the imperial rights of Charles the Fat. At any rate, Eudes, Berenger, and Hermengard all turned to him for confirmation of their claims. It was to make good her petition that Hermengard paid a visit to Arnulf at Forcheim after Easter, in the May of 890, according to the above-mentioned continuation of the Annals of Fulda; but really in 889, as appears from a diploma of Arnulf, cited by Muratori.[3] The energetic widow was successful in both her appeals; and at the council or diet of Valence (August 890) Louis was proclaimed king by the bishops and nobles of the new kingdom. The acts of the council[4] relate that, on the personal representations of Bernoinus, archbishop of Vienne, Pope Stephen, "on whom rests the care of all the churches," both by word and writing urged the bishops of

[1] *Cf.* Duchesne, *Le provincial Romain au XIIe siècle*, p. 112 ff., in *Mélanges d'archéol.*, etc., 1904.

[2] "Including Provence, Dauphiné, the S. part of Savoy, and the country between the Saone and the Jura." Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 429.

[3] *Annal.*, ad an. 889–90.

[4] Ap. Labbe, ix. 424–5; or *Capitular.*, ed. Bor., ii. 376.

"Cisalpine Gaul" to elect Louis king. This he did, because he had been moved "even to tears" by the story which the archbishop had to tell of the miseries of the country after the death of Boso. It had been harassed "not only by its own people, whom no power could restrain, but by the pagans. On the one side had pressed the devastating Northmen, and on the other the Saracens had laid waste Provence and reduced the country to a desert." Moved by the letters of the Pope, and asserting that the emperor Charles (The Fat) had already granted him the kingly dignity, and that Arnulf, "his successor," had done the same, the archbishops and bishops of the kingdom proclaimed Louis their sovereign. We shall meet with Louis again, full of his mother's ambition, and contending for the imperial title.

Correspondence with archbishops. (i.) Aurelian of Lyons.

Frodoard has preserved for us extracts of Pope Stephen's correspondence with various archbishops of France, among others with Aurelian of Lyons, who was present at the council of Valence. On the death of Isaac, bishop of Langres,[1] Aurelian consecrated to fill the vacant See, Egilon, abbot of Noirmoutier, without consulting clergy or people. Not to be treated in the same cavalier fashion a second time, the clergy and people unanimously elected Teutbold, a deacon of the church of Langres, "when God called Egilon (or Geilon) to Himself"[2] (*c.* 887), and begged the Pope himself to consecrate their candidate. But, says the historian, "anxious[3] to preserve intact the privileges of each church," Stephen would not consecrate him, but sent him to Aurelian, and bade the archbishop consecrate him

[1] Owing to the ravages of the Normans, the See was at this time fixed at Tournus.

[2] Frodoard, *Hist. Rem.*, iv. 1, p. 417 f.

[3] "Sed ille uniuscujusque Ecclesiæ privilegium inconcussum servare volens"—a declaration which Fulk assured the Pope gave general satisfaction. *Ib.*, p. 421.

at once, if it were the fact that he had received the suffrages of clergy and people, and if there were no canonical impediment in the way. If there proved to be any obstacle, the Pope was to be informed of it, and Aurelian was not to consecrate another without consulting the Pope. To see to the carrying out of these orders Stephen despatched, as his legate *a latere*, Oirann, bishop of Sinigaglia. Aurelian procrastinated, and again was Teutbold sent to Rome for consecration. And again, too, for the same reason did the Pope do as he had done before. Thereupon, construing Stephen's excessive desire for fairness into a confession of weakness, Aurelian set the Pope's orders at naught, and furtively consecrated another stranger[1] for the Church of Langres. Determined not to accept the candidate thus foisted upon them, the people of Langres again betook themselves to the Pope. This time Stephen did consecrate Teutbold, and wrote to Fulk of Rheims to install him at once. This Fulk could not do before King Eudes was assured by the report of his own ambassadors that such was the Pope's will. This 'Langres' incident, which has been related almost in the exact words of Frodoard, shows Pope Stephen as the champion of the rights of bishops and people alike. The true verdict of history notes this rôle as a distinctive feature of the line of the Sovereign Pontiffs, even if it be true that, for a period during the Middle Ages, it applied itself to curtailing the power of the former, for the

[1] But the 'stranger' (Argrim) had friends, and, for some "useful reason," Formosus (c. 896) not only recognised him as bishop of Langres, but gave him the right to wear the pallium (*Cf.* Hugh of Flavigny, *Chron.*, l. i. p. 171; and a bull of Bened. IV (900), Jaffé, 3527, or 1st ed. 2708. The dispute went on; but, "in accordance with the advice of a synod of bishops and others," John IX. (899) reaffirmed the decision of Formosus "not as though condemning the decree of Pope Stephen, but changing it for useful reasons." Jaffé, 3520 1, or 1st ed., 2704–5. Benedict IV. had also to confirm the previous decisions in favour of Argrim. *Ib.*, 3527–8 (2708–9).

all-necessary purpose of drawing closer the bonds between the ruling authorities in the Church and its Head. It was tyrannical conduct on the part of such metropolitans as Aurelian that inspired the publication of the False Decretals, and not any 'grasping ambition' of the Popes. To Rome the oppressed ever turned, always sure of sympathy and generally of effectual aid.

(ii.) Frothar of Bordeaux.

Aurelian, however, was not always in opposition. About the same time that he was interfering with the liberties of the Church of Langres, he was commissioned by the Pope, along with various other bishops, to put a check on the doings of Frothar of Bordeaux. Owing to the ravages of the Normans, the latter had been allowed, with the consent of John VIII.,[1] to exchange his See of Bordeaux for that of Bourges till such times as he might be able to return to his proper See. But Frothar not only usurped also the See of Poitiers, but seems to have made himself disliked by the people of Bourges. Their complaints were carried to the Pope. Stephen decided that, as the cause of Frothar's translation had disappeared, the archbishop must return to his original See or incur excommunication.[2] Frothar does not seem to have obeyed; for Hugh of Flavigny, who wrote a chronicle in the early years of the twelfth century, has preserved a fragment[3] of a letter of the Pope to Aurelian of Lyons, in which that archbishop is ordered to consecrate a new bishop for Bordeaux "on account of the effrontery of Frothar." It is supposed that Frothar's death put an end to any further difficulties. The affair is not without its interest, as it adds to the evidence that, in ecclesiastical matters at this period, the higher clergy were as insubordinate, and acted with almost as much license, as the greater nobles in civil affairs.

[1] Joan. Epp. 35–7, 64. [2] Frod., *ib.*
[3] Ap. *M. G. SS.*, viii. p 356; or *P. L.*, t. 154.

(iii.) Romanus and Dominicus of Ravenna.

Passing over, for the present,[1] Stephen's correspondence[2] with Herimann of Cologne on the subject of the restoration of the See of Bremen to the jurisdiction of its archiepiscopal See, it may be noted that Stephen's dealings with the archbishop of Ravenna also serve to show his great regard for the rights of others. For if he severely blames (887–8) Romanus of Ravenna for venturing, against the canons, to elect his successor, and orders[3] him to undo what he has attempted; he is careful, on the other hand, to explain[4] to Dominicus, the successor of Romanus, that in consecrating a bishop for Piacenza during the vacancy of the See of Ravenna, he had no wish to detract from its rights.

(iv.) Photius.

But of all the ecclesiastics concerning whom Stephen had correspondence, the most important was Photius. Hadrian III. had received from the emperor Basil a sharp letter in which, among other points, the election of Marinus, who had shown himself the most uncompromising opponent of Photius, had been vigorously attacked. To this document, inspired, as the Pope plainly insinuates, by Photius, Stephen sent a temperate yet firm reply. It well deserves to be quoted in its entirety. "We have received[5] the letter of your serenity addressed to our predecessor Hadrian, and we are very much astonished that you could write in the way you have—you, who hold the scales of justice, and who know well that our[6] sacerdotal and apostolical dignity is not subject to the power of kings. For though on earth you are the image of our emperor Christ, you ought to confine your attention to what belongs to this earth—as

[1] *Cf.* vol. iv. of this work under Formosus.
[2] Frodoard, *ib.*; and Jaffé, 3458, 3470 (2648, 2666).
[3] Lowenfeld, Ep. 62. [4] Jaffé, 3455–6 (2646–7).
[5] Ep. 1, ap. Labbe, viii. 1391, or ix. 366–8.
[6] "Quod manui regiæ non subjiciatur sacerdotalis et apostolica nostra dignitas."

we pray God you may be spared for many years to do. As you have been by God set over worldly affairs, so through Peter, the prince (of the apostles), have we been placed by God over spiritual concerns. Take, we beg you, in good part what follows. It is yours to break the might of tyrants with the sword of power, to dispense justice to your subjects, to make laws, to regulate the military and naval forces (of the empire). These are the chief duties of your imperial power. But a care of the flock has been entrusted to us, a care as much more noble as heaven is distant from earth. Hearken to the Lord's words to Peter: 'Thou art Peter,' etc. (S. Mat. xvi. 18). But what says He about power and empire: 'Fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul' (S. Mat. x. 28). Hence we beg you to abide by the decrees of the princes of the apostles, to honour their name and dignity. The episcopate of the world is dependent upon (*ortum accepit*) St. Peter, through whom we with doctrine most pure and undefiled teach all.[1] But let not your majesty (*regnum*), by reason of your power over lesser matters, boldly assert itself to decide on higher affairs; rather reflect by what authority you would do this. He who, by his slanders, has poisoned your ears against the most holy Marinus, would not refrain from blaspheming our Lord Jesus Christ. Who, on the one hand, is he who has dared to say such things against His stainless spouse and priest, and against the mother of all Churches? At any rate he is deceived should he think that 'the disciple is above the master, or the servant above his lord' (S. Mat. x. 24). We are truly astonished to see your consummate prudence seduced into

[1] The first part of this passage is somewhat obscurely expressed: "Institutio enim et sacerdotium omnium quæ in orbe sunt ecclesiarum a principe Petro ortum accepit, per quem etiam nos sincerissima et purissima doctrina monemus omnes et docemus."

entertaining such thoughts against that holy man (Marinus). For were we not to say who he was, the very stones would tell of him.

"If you are of the number of the sheep of God,[1] as we trust you are, transgress not the limits of the princes of the apostles. Who has induced you, we would ask, to assail with ridicule the universal Pope, and to rail against the holy Roman Church, to which with all reverence you are bound to submit? Know you not that she is the head (*princeps*) of all Churches? Who has made you a judge of bishops, by whose holy teaching you ought to be guided and by whom prayers are offered to God for you? . . . . You have written that he (Marinus) was not Pope. How knew you that? And if you knew it not, why were you so quick to pass sentence on him? Those who hold that Marinus was already a bishop and hence could not be transferred from one See to another, must prove that assertion. Know, most honoured emperor, that though that impediment could be urged against him (which it could not[2]), there are examples enough to justify his being raised to the first See. . . . . What has the Roman Church done that that seducer has led you to raise your voice against her? Is it that, in accordance with ancient custom, no letter was sent to you concerning the assembling of the Constantinopolitan synod? . . . . But to whom was the Roman Church to write? To the layman Photius? If you had a patriarch, our Church would often communicate with him by letter. . . . . But for our love for you, we should have been compelled to inflict on the prevaricator

[1] In this category the emperor had proclaimed himself to be at the close of the Eighth General Council. Labbe, viii. 1154.

[2] When Marinus was elected Pope he was archdeacon of the Roman Church. Perhaps Stephen means that Marinus had resigned his See when he was made archdeacon, and so could not be said to have been translated from one See to another when he was elected Pope.

Photius more severe penalties than our predecessors have done. . . . . We warn you, son of ours in spirit, rise not up against the Roman Church. We were glad to hear that you had destined one of your sons (Stephen, his youngest son) for the priesthood. We beg you to send us some well-equipped war-ships (to guard the coast) from April to September, as well as soldiers to defend our walls from the Saracens. (Concerning their ravages), we will only note that we lack even oil for the lamps used in the service of God."

Final deposition of Photius, 886.

When this dignified letter reached Constantinople, Basil the Macedonian was dead, and his son Leo VI., surnamed the Wise, reigned in his stead (886–912). Towards Photius, "the most gracious and sweet"[1] Leo had never been well disposed, and when he received the Pope's letter he took advantage of it to depose Photius. He assembled "all the priests of the truth" (who, condemned by Photius, had suffered grievous persecutions), exiled him, and proclaimed his young brother, Stephen, patriarch. Then addressing Stylian and the other adherents of Ignatius, he told them what had been done, and begged them to communicate with the new patriarch. "But if, seeing that he was ordained deacon by Photius, you would rather not communicate with him until you have consulted the Romans who condemned Photius, let us write and ask the Pope to grant a dispensation from censures to those ordained by Photius. Accordingly the emperor wrote to the Pope, as did also Stylian of Neocæsarea and his friends."[2]

[1] So is he called even by Arethas, archbishop of Cæsarea, and an adherent of Photius. See his Epitaphios, p. 32, ap. *Mon. Græca et Latina pertinent. ad hist. Photii*, ed. Papadopulos-Kerameus, St. Petersburg, 1899. To Arethas Photius is a hero, and he has no hesitation in placing him "in the innermost sanctuary of heaven." *Cf. ib.*, pp. 35, 40.

[2] So runs the Greek codex which contains the letters of Stephen VI., Stylian, etc. (Labbe, ix. 368).

If Photius, now shut up in a monastery, was practically dead to the world, "the evil which he had done lived after him." By his letter to Walbert, patriarch of Aquileia, and other writings, he had long been busy in trying to show that the Latin Church[1] was in error by teaching, contrary to the tradition of the Fathers, that the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost, proceeded from the Father *and the Son*. The Greek Church, in harmony with the doctrines of the Fathers, as he maintained, taught, on the other hand, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father *only*. Ignoring those passages of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, where the doctrine of the Catholic Church was clearly and distinctly stated, he affected to have proved his point when he had shown that it was often said that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father. That was enough. The Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father, *therefore* not from the Father and the Son, but from the Father *only*. And he infers, equally falsely, that because the Westerns taught that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, He did so, according to them, by a double procession (*δευτέρᾳ προόδῳ*); and that hence He was the Grandson (*υἱωνός*) of God the Father.

Effects of the work of Photius.

It is not the place here to show that, in accordance with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, as from one principle, by one procession. It is enough to state now that,

[1] "Certain of the Westerns maintain that the Holy Spirit proceeds not only from God the Father, but also from the Son," Ep. ad Wals. In Jager's *Photius*, the original Greek text is given, p. 452 f.; and a French translation, p. 360 f. Photius and Walbert entered into communication with each other for the same rebellious causes that moved Gunther to make advances to Photius. There is a fragment of a letter of Stephen VI. to Walbert (*P. L.*, t. 129, p. 805, Ep. 16) which shows that Walbert was openly disobeying the Pope's orders. The letter of Photius was written after the death of John VIII., who is spoken of as "among the saints." *Cf.* Lapôtre, *Jean VIII.*, p. 68 n.

while Photius and his works sank into oblivion at this period, it was from the armoury of his works that were afterwards drawn the subtle swords which were most used to sever the union of East and West, and to keep it severed. Of all the enemies of that united kingdom on earth which Our Lord came from heaven to establish, Photius was the most deadly. And if he did harm to the Church, he did as much to the State. Under the guiding hand of the See of Peter, the West, despite a thousand obstacles, moved on to civilisation, to learning, and to liberty. The East, following first one and then another heresiarch condemned by Rome, hurried back to barbarism, ignorance, and despotism. And, with that miserable fatality with which men not unfrequently cling to what is ruining and degrading them, the East is to-day proud of Photius who freed them from the thraldom of Rome, and gave them military despotism in Church and State, national misery and poverty, and superstitious ignorance and fanaticism.

The letter of Stylian to the Pope.

The letter which the emperor Leo wrote to the Pope has not been preserved. The letter of Stylian to him is the one which, containing a succinct account of the doings of Photius, has been already so often quoted. It is addressed: "To the most holy and most blessed Stephen, Lord and œcumenical Pope, Stylian bishop of Neocæsarea of the province of Euphratesia and the bishops who are with me, as well as all the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Church of Constantinople, all the superiors (of the monks) in the eastern and western portions (of the empire),[1] and all the priests, who as monks lead a retired life." After recounting in brief the history of the usurpations of Photius, Stylian proceeds to address himself to the Pope, whom he styles "sacred and venerated head." "As we know that we

[1] Ep. Styl., ap. Labbe viii. or ix., p. 367 f. "Omnes præpositi per occidentem et orientem constituti."

must be corrected, and, according to the canons, punished by your Apostolic See, we humbly beg your holiness to have mercy on us—*i.e.* on those who not without some show of good reason accepted the ordination of Photius, so that he who received the legates of the Apostolic See, Radoald and Zachary (who in the beginning confirmed Photius in the See of Constantinople), and then Eugenius and Paul (who a second time communicated with Photius), may not be condemned equally with Photius; and so that another great number may not be driven from the Church." Examples are then adduced to show that to grant pardon in similar cases has been the custom of the Church. "Hence it well becomes you to expel Photius, a schismatic from the beginning, ordained by schismatics and a worker of innumerable evils; but, on the other hand, we entreat you to deal mercifully with those who have been deceived by him." . . . Stylian goes on to tell the Pope that some wished him to communicate with them on the ground that they had received a dispensation from the Pope to exercise their sacerdotal functions; but that, pending instructions from the Apostolic See, he had refrained from doing so. "Though[1] I would venture to assert this, O venerated head, that none of those who communicated with Photius did so of their own will, but rather compelled by the violence of princes."

To this letter Stephen replied[2] that he was not astonished that they had expelled Photius, already condemned by the Church, but that he was surprised that whereas their letter spoke of the expulsion of Photius, that of the emperor stated that he had resigned. Hence before he can pronounce

[1] "Hoc autem ausim affirmare, O venerandum caput . . . . quod nullus eorum, qui cum Photio communicarunt, propria id fecit voluntate, sed potius principum violentia." Labbe, ix. 372.

[2] Ep. 2, ap. Labbe, ix. 373.

sentence, bishops from both parties must be sent to him that he may find out the whole truth. "For," he concluded, "the Roman Church [1] has been set as a model and example to the other churches. Whatever it defines has to remain for ever inviolate, and so it is only right for her to pass sentence after careful examination." This letter was written about the year 888. Some time elapsed before the Pope's requirements were complied with; and when at length ambassadors and letters did arrive in Rome from Constantinople, Stephen was dead or dying. Stylian's reply has come down [2] to us. In it the discrepancy pointed out by Pope Stephen between the letter of the emperor and that of the Greek bishops is explained. "Those who have written that Photius has renounced his See are those who have recognised him as a bishop. But we, who following the decisions of Popes Nicholas and Hadrian, do not consider that he possesses the least vestige of the priesthood, how could we write that he had renounced (the patriarchal See)?" . . . "But," continues the letter, "we renew our entreaties for those who have recognised Photius by force, and we beg you to send circular letters to the patriarchs of the East, in order that they may extend the like indulgence towards them."

Letter of Pope Formosus to Stylian.

In the answer [3] which Stephen's successor, Formosus, sent to this letter (end of 891 or beginning of 892), he pointed out that, in the request for pardon, it had not been stated whether there was question of laymen or clerics. The laity deserve pardon, continued the Pope. But the case of the clerics is different. However, as Stylian has asked him "to tolerate some things, but to abolish others," he is sending,

[1] "Romana enim ecclesia instar speculi et exemplaris reliquis ecclesiis constituitur. Et quodcumque definierit, in sempiterum manet incorruptum, et hac de causa sententias magna cum inquisitione ferre decet." *Ib.*

[2] Labbe, viii. 1410.

[3] Ep. Form.; ap. Labbe, ix. 428–9.

as legates, bishops Landenulf of Capua and Romanus, to go into the different matters with Stylian himself, Theophylactus, metropolitan of Ancyra, and a certain Peter, a trusted friend of his. After the renewal of the condemnation of Photius himself, those who had been ordained by him might be received into lay communion if they offered a written confession that they had done wrong, and humbly asked for pardon. What is contained in his (the Pope's) instructions to his legates must be closely followed.

Close of the Schism.

Of the doings of this embassy, unfortunately, nothing is known. But the biography of Antony Cauleas, who is regarded both by the Greeks and Latins as a saint, and who succeeded the youthful Stephen (May 17, 893) in the patriarchal chair, states[1] that he again brought peace to the Church, and reunited the East and West. Still, for some time after this, correspondence went on with Rome on the subject of those who had been ordained by Photius. And though Stylian continued to ask for pardon for them, the Popes persevered in ratifying the policy of their predecessors. Hence John IX. (898–900), while praising the archbishop for his continued and unflinching loyalty to "his mother the Roman Church," declares that he accepts Ignatius, Photius, Stephen, and Antony to the same extent as Popes Nicholas, John, Stephen VI. (Sextus, as John calls him), and the whole Roman Church have done, and that he grants to those who have been ordained by them the same concessions as those granted to them by his predecessors. He exhorts Stylian to do likewise, and looks forward to the schism, which has lasted nearly forty years, being healed by the archbishop's prayers.[2] After this, we hear no more

[1] *Cf.* Hergenroether, *Hist. de l'église*, iii. 433. Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, February 12. All his successors for 150 years till Michael Cerularius, except Sisinnius (996–8), were in communion with Rome.

[2] Ep. Joan. IX., ap. Mansi, xvi. 456; Harduin, v. It is imperfectly given—ap. Labbe, ix. 494.

of Photius or his works for some time. "It seemed in the tenth century as though his memory was to be consigned to oblivion. But after the middle of the eleventh century, his works were again brought to the light, and in the twelfth century he was reckoned by the Greek schismatics among the doctors of the Church; though it was not till the sixteenth century that they ranked him among their saints."[1]

Affairs of S. Italy.

No doubt during the reign of Stephen VI. negotiations with Constantinople were much hindered by the condition of affairs in South Italy. In the midst of the disorders still being caused by Saracen raids and internal feuds among the principalities, the Greeks continued to improve their hold upon that part of Italy. Soon after the death of Stephen they even captured (October 18, 891) Beneventum. It is significant of their power that the patrician George, after expelling the candidate who had been canonically elected bishop of Tarentum and who in accordance with ancient custom was to have come to Rome for his consecration, wished to intrude a candidate of his own, and have him consecrated at Constantinople.[2]

Atenolfus.

What Erchempert tells[3] us of the career of the perjured Atenolfus is well calculated to furnish a clear idea of the men and the actions which were leaving South Italy open to be preyed upon by Greek and Saracen. Among his other famous or rather infamous doings, he came to an understanding with the intriguing Athanasius, prince-bishop of Naples, and seized Capua (January 7, 887), of which his brother Lando was count. In accordance with the terms of the agreement he had made with Athanasius, he declared

[1] Hergenroether, *Hist. de l'église*, iii. 433.

[2] Ep. ap. Loewenfeld, p. 36. As a matter of fact, "the Church of Constantinople," at this time (887-8) governed by the young Stephen, refused to consecrate George's candidate. *Ib.*

[3] *Hist.*, c. 53 and 62 f.

himself the vassal of the bishop, and sent him his son as a hostage. Tiring, however, of this dependence, Atenolfus procured the assistance of Guido of Spoleto and obtained the restoration of his son. Then, no doubt with a view to getting free from any restraint from Guido, he turned to Pope Stephen, and offered to place himself in subjection to the See of Rome, to restore Gaeta (which he had treacherously seized), and to help the Pope against the Saracens on the Garigliano. "These promises," quietly adds the monk, "Atenolfus[1] *forgot*, and of course did not fulfil any one of them!" Then, having taken what belonged to his brother, viz. the lordship of Capua, Atenolfus proceeded to annex all the property which belonged to the monastery of Monte Cassino and which was situated within the territory of Capua. This famous monastery, destroyed by the Saracens in 883, had begun to be rebuilt by the abbot Angelarius (886). Justly indignant, the abbot despatched our historian to Rome. Erchempert returned with the papal blessing for the monks, a papal privilege for the monastery, and hortatory letters addressed to the spoiler. Monte Cassino regained its property; but wreaking his vengeance on the ambassador, Atenolfus seized everything of which Erchempert was possessed, "even[2] the cell which had been given me by the abbot."

To avenge the treatment he had received at the hands of Atenolfus, Athanasius sent against Capua (888) an army composed of Greeks, Neapolitans, and Saracens. With help, both Saracenic and otherwise, obtained from Aio, Duke of Beneventum (the latest of those to whom Atenolfus had proffered his *submission*), the Count of

[1] Erch., c. 65.

[2] *Ib.*, c. 69. *Cf.* Tosti, *Storia della Badia di Monte Cassino* (Napoli, 1842), l. ii., vol. i., p. 135 ff.

Capua advanced to meet his enemies. And while the Christians were slaughtering one another, the Saracens of both sides quietly joined hands and looked on.[1] Atenolfus was victorious, and showed his gratitude to his benefactor by denying him the help which he soon afterwards stood in need of against the Greeks, and which he had in vain tried to purchase from Franks or Saracens. With the assistance of these latter, who now attached themselves to him as the stronger man, Atenolfus turned against Athanasius and fearfully harried the territory of Naples. So that, reflects our historian,[2] those who by the aid of the Saracens had sent innumerable Christians to captivity and death were, by the just judgment of God, in turn themselves scourged by them. "Who," he asks with the Preacher,[3] "will pity an enchanter struck by a serpent, or any that come near wild beasts?"

Death of the Pope.

With South Italy a prey to men with the passions of an Atenolfus—to Franks, to Saracens, and to Greeks[4] (worse than the Saracens)—with North Italy the battlefield of rival *emperors*, and with Rome itself full of conspiring factions,[5] the days of the amiable yet firm Stephen VI. came to a close (*c.* September 891). With the political horizon as black as we have described it, and soon with the advent of wild Hungarian hordes to become blacker, we are prepared to see the storm of unbridled anarchy that swept over Italy in the course of the next hundred and fifty years, well nigh swamping in its fury the bark of Peter itself.

[1] Erch., c. 73. "Saraceni vero ex utraque parte juncti steterunt, nulli eorum prebentes auxilium."

[2] *Ib.*, c. 77. [3] Ecclus., xii. 13.

[4] "Vocabulo Christiani, sed moribus tristiores Agarenis," Erch., c. 81.

[5] Fulco of Rheims wrote to the Pope, "Audisse se de insidiis quorumdam pestilentium, quas ipsi papæ moliebantur," Frod., *Hist. Rem.*, iv. 1.

Stephen's tomb was in the portico of the old St. Peter's. His epitaph,[1] preserved by Mallius, is conceived in a happier vein that many of the others we have cited :—

"Accedis quisquis magni suffragia Petri
Celestis regni poscere clavigeri,
Intentis oculis, compuncto corde, locellum
Conspice perspicuum quo pia membra jacent.
Hic tumulus quinti sacratos continet artus
Præsulis eximii pontificis Stephani ;
Bis ternis populum qui rexit et urbem,
Et gessit Domino quæ fuerunt placita.
Suscepit tellus consumptum pulvere corpus,
Ethera sed scandit spiritus almus ovans.
Unde, peto, cuncti venientes dicite fratres :
Arbiter omnipotens, da veniam Stephano."

"Whoever thou art who comest, with contrite heart, to beg the prayers of Peter, the great key-bearer of the heavenly kingdom, gaze with clear eye on the spot where a holy body lieth. This tomb contains the sacred remains of the great pontiff Stephen V., who for twice three years ruled the people and the City, and did what was pleasing in the eyes of God. The earth has received his body turned to dust, but his sweet soul has in triumph ascended into heaven. Do ye, brethren who come hither, pray the Almighty Judge, I beg you, to grant pardon to Stephen."

Condemns trial by ordeal.

Among the decrees attributed to this Pope is one of peculiar interest. Consulted by Liutbert, archbishop of Mayence, as to whether in a certain specified case it was lawful to employ the ordeals of hot iron or boiling water, Stephen replied in the negative, and on such general grounds as amounted to a condemnation of the whole system of ordeals—so dear to the Northern nations. "It is ours," he declared, "to judge of crimes that are known either by the confession of the culprit, or by the testimony of witnesses. What (cannot be discovered by those means, and) remains completely hidden, must be left to the judgment of Him who alone knows the hearts of the

[1] *L. P.*, ii. p. 226.

children of men."[1] The practice of 'ordeals' was not abolished by the Church all at once. Its roots, like those of the system of slavery, had struck too deep down to be violently eradicated at one pull. But, under her guidance, first those ordeals which involved danger to life were adolished, and, when in process of time the justice of the principles stated by Stephen VI. had been driven home, then the whole custom of appealing to the "judgments of God" was set aside.

Anglo-Saxons come to Rome.

We cannot leave the biography of Stephen without calling attention to the fact that, despite the rapidly increasing difficulties of the journey to Rome, love of the "Eternal City" and its ruler still attracted our countrymen to Rome. In fact, as an entry in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, soon to be quoted, shows, it was regarded in England as noteworthy if a year passed *without* some distinguished persons leaving this island for Rome. It will suffice here to quote Stevenson's translation of the entries made in our earliest Chronicle without further comment :—

"A.D. 887.—Aethelhelm, the ealdorman, carried the alms of the West Saxons and King Ælfred to Rome.

"A.D. 888.—This year Beocca, the ealdorman, carried the alms of the West Saxons and King Ælfred to Rome; and Queen Aethelswith, who was King Ælfred's sister, died on the way to Rome, and her body lies at Pavia.

"A.D. 889.—In this year there was *no journey* to Rome, except that King Ælfred sent two couriers with letters.

"A.D. 890.—This year abbot Beornhelm took the aforesaid alms to Rome;" or, as the notice reads in the Chronicle of

[1] Ivo. *Decret.*, x. c. 27; Jaffé, 3443 (2642). On the subject of 'ordeals,' *cf.* vol. ii. p. 179 f. of this work; Lingard, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, ii. p. 118 f. (ed. Baker); Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, x. 259 n. Alzog, *Ch. Hist.*, ii. 113.

the noble Ethelwerd (an. 889), he "carried to Rome the alms for the people, and principally those of the western English and King Alfred."

Coins. On three of the known denarii of this Pope, we find on the obverse the names: "Steph." and "Scs. Petrus;" and, on the reverse, three have "Carolus Imp." There are extant also, in Promis, two others evidently struck after the deposition of Charles the Fat. Of these one has, on the obverse, the Pope's name and that of St. Paul, and, on the reverse, Scs. Petrus and Rome; the other is of the same type, but with the names of the apostles reversed.[1]

Conclusion to volume. With Stephen VI. we bring to a conclusion our account of the Popes under the Carolingian emperors. It may perhaps be thought that, as Formosus was so much connected with Stephen VI. and his immediate predecessors, his biography should have been included in this volume. But apart from the fact that, wherever a division was made, some things that ought to be closely joined would have to be separated, the last of the Carolingian emperors died during the pontificate of Stephen VI.; and Formosus is probably more connected in the minds of men with the treatment his dead body received at the hands of Stephen VII., than with the deeds during life which he accomplished in connection with Boris of Bulgaria or with any of his predecessors in the chair of Peter.

Full of the deeds of lasting fame performed by SS. Leo III. and IV., Nicholas[2] the Great, and Hadrian II., gazing with admiration at the old hero John VIII., priest, soldier, and sailor in one, the last doughty champion of law and order in Italy for many a weary year, the historian leaves

[1] Promis, Tav. v.

[2] With Michael the Drunkard and Lothaire of Lorraine, what would the Christian world in the ninth century have come to but for such Popes as Nicholas I. and Hadrian II.?

with regret the line of the great Popes of the ninth century —a line that has earned the praise of Catholic and non-Catholic writers alike. He is the more loath to leave the bright light of their deeds from the fact that the outlook is gloomy to the last degree. He has to pass from contemplating Peter in honour by the side of his Divine Master, to consider him in dishonour—to behold him but too often the sport of petty princes instead of the respected of the universe. He has to write of the "iron age" of Cardinal Baronius. But as the Rock of Peter was not broken by the fierce blows dealt it for three hundred years by the masters of the civilised world; as it was not dissolved when "the world awoke and found itself Arian," nor shattered when the barbarians broke in pieces the majestic might of old Rome; as it was not overturned by Byzantine astuteness nor Frankish violence, so we shall find that it did not even crumble by any internal decay; for was not the Rock of Peter embedded in the eternal Rock, which is Christ? Had not the strength of the bed-Rock passed into the Rock of the foundation? Indeed, is it ever destined to fail? for was it not of it that was said: "I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world" (S. Mat. xxviii. 20)? If well nigh submerged by the waves of the barbarism of the tenth century, the following century will not have half run its course before the Rock of Peter will be seen towering up aloft above the waters, a pillar of strength to those who leaned upon it, a source of dread to those who would rear themselves up against it.

APPENDIX.

THE DUKES OF SPOLETO.

Guido (or Guy) I., 838–866.
Lambert I. (son of Guido I.), 866–871.
Suppo II., 871–879 or 880.
Guido II. (son of Lambert I.), 879 (880)–c. 883.
Guido III. (brother of Lambert I.), c. 883–891.[1] He became King of Italy in 889, and emperor in 891.

[1] It cannot be said that this table is more than approximately accurate.

INDEX.

Abbasid dynasty, 319 ff.
Achrida, 121, 212, 254.
Actard of Nantes, 165 ff.
Acts of the eighth general council, 201 n.
Adalbert I. of Tuscany, 277, 304 f.
Adam of Bremen, 3.
Adelgisus, 187, 281, 322, 325.
Ademar of Chabannes, 300.
Ado, 134, 156, 158 n., 163.
Æmelia, 97.
Æneas of Paris, 68.
Agapetus, 227 f.
Aglabites, 320.
Aldric, 142 n.
Alfonso III., 296, 324, 340 f.
Alfred, 343, 359, 399.
Altino, 336.
Amalfi, 330, 381.
Anastasius the librarian, 81, 89, 134, 149, 153 n., ff., 156, 163 f., 190, 203 ff., 254, 289.
Anathema, meaning of, 286 n.
Andrew of Bergamo, 277 n.
Angelramn, 137.
Annalista Saxo, 71.
Anno, bishop of Freising, 239 f.
Ansegisus of Sens, 291 f., 345.
Ansgar, St., 121.
Anspert, 265 n., 310, 314.
Anterus, 226.
Antony Cauleas, St., 394.
Apocrisiarius of the Holy See, 283 n.
Aqua Jovia, 5 n., 126.
Aqueducts, 126 f.
Arcona, 109.
Arles, see of, 306, 345.
Arnold of Lubeck, 3.
Arnulf, duke of Carinthia, 243, 244 n., 376, 378 f., 382 f.
Arsenius of Horta, 78, 88 ff., 114, 125, 153, 163.
Atenolfus, 395 ff.
Athanasius, brother of Sergius, 322, 327, 330, 332 ff., 395 ff.
Athanasius, St., 189.
Aurelian of Lyons, 383 f.

Baldwin of Flanders, 92.
Bardas, 40 f., 62.
Bari, 187, 320, 329.
Basil the Macedonian, 62, 67, 190 ff., 198 ff., 249 ff., 258, 270, 334.
Basil II., 254.
Bavaria, patrimonies of Holy See in, 78.
Benedict, canon, 152 n., 286.

Benedict Levita, 137.
Berenger of Friuli, 277, 305, 356, 377 ff.
Bishops, hebdomadary-cardinal, 347 f.
Bishop, Mr., 233.
Bog, 109.
Bogislav, Stephen, 381.
Boniface I., 60.
Books, papal censorship of, 107, 131.
Boris, 112 f., 209, 244, 249, 285.
Boso, duke and king, 296, 306, 308 f., 316 f., 324, 382.
Branimir, 247, 252.
Bremen, 121.
Brittany, 94.
Bulgaria, ecclesiastical jurisdiction over, 118 ff., 208, 210 ff., 260 ff.
Bulgarians, the, 62, 64, 81 n., 108, 111 ff., 218, 249 ff., 268, 270.
Burchard of Worms, 139 n.
Burgundy, Transjurane, 377.
Burhred, 343.
Byzantium, bishops of, 25.

CAIROWAN, 320.
Calabria, 47, 324.
Calojan Jonitza, 253.
Cambray, 91.
Camelaucum, 14, n.
Canterbury, privileges of, 344.
Cardinals, regulations concerning, 346
Carinthia, 111.
Carloman, 182 ff.
Carloman, Son of Louis the German, 182 ff., 277, 295, 300 ff., 313 f., 317.
Cartulary Tower, 229.
Catalogue, the papal, 231.
Causæ majores, 132, 144.
Cervetri, 272, 354
Cervia, 72.
Charles the Bald, 70, 72, 123 f., 165 f., 168 ff., 171 ff., 175 ff., 274 ff., 289 f., 296 ff., 330.
Charles the Fat, 277, 295, 309, 313–8, 332, 355 ff., 364, 369, 376, 382 f.
Charles the Simple, 317, 376.
Christianity not to be spread by force, 116.
Churches:
  Quatuor Coronati, 368 f.
  S. Clement, 14.
  S. Dionysius, basilica of, 9.
  S. Eustachius, 288.
  S. Lawrence in Damaso, 227.
  S. Maria ad Praesepe, 155.
  S. Maria Antiqua, 127.
  S. Maria in Aquiro, 288.
  S. Maria in Cosmedin, 5 n.
  S. Maria in Via Lata, 288.
  S. Mark, 151.
  S. Paul, outside-the-walls, 327.
  S. Peter, 127, 374.
  S. Silvester in Capite, 10.
Circe, battle of, 323.
Clement, St. (Pope), 15, 27, 28, 218, 221 f.
Coena Cypriani, 235, 389.
Constantine IV. (Pogonatus), 112.
Constantinople, church of, 116, 130.
Constantinople, patriarchs of, 23 n, 34 n.
Cornomannia, festival, 286 ff.
Coronation, papal, 11 ff.
Councils:
  Aix-la-Chapelle (860) 70, (862) 71.
  Attigny, 171, 184.
  Constantinople, (861) 47, 56, (867) 65, (869, the eighth general) 200, (879, of Photius), 266.

Douzi-les-Près, 147, 167, 171, 178.
Kiersy, (858) 125, 169.
Metz, 73.
Pistres, (862) 85.
Pontion, 277 n., 291 f.
Ravenna, (877) 298 f.
Rome, (862) 10, (863) 55, 74, (861) 97 f., (869) 195, (879) 257.
Savonnière, 72.
Senlis, 184.
Soissons, (861) 85, (862) 85, (866) 167.
Troyes, 178, (878) 307.
Valence, 106, (890) 382.
Verberie, (863) 96, (869) 170.
Councils and the Holy See, 70 n., 131.
Croatia, 246.
Croats, 110, 215.
Crowns, use of, in matrimony, 115.
Cyril, St., 15, 111, 215 ff.
Cyrilic alphabet. 218 f.

Dalmatia, 110, 379 ff.
Damasus, St., 226.
Data ut supra, 252 n.
Deaconesses, 11 n.
Decretals, false, and Nicholas I., 12, 135 ff.
Denmark, Christianity in, 122.
Dioclea (Dukla), Presbyter of, 381.
Dionysius the Areopagite, 106.
Dionysius the Little, 137, 145 ff.
Doellinger quoted, 271 n.
Dol, 94.
Domagoi, 215, 220, 249 n.
Dominicus, 336 f., 386.
Donation of Charles the Bald, 293 f.
Donatus, 114.

Edred, or Ethelred, 343.
Egilo, 105.
Einsiedeln, anonymous of, 375 n.
Elections, papal, 10.
Eleutherius, 163.
Emperors and Popes: their duties, 61, 386 f.
Empire, the, and the Papacy, 363.
Encomium of monk Michael, 44 n.
Engelberga, 275 f., 306.
England and Rome, 343, 399.
English in Rome, 127.
Epitome of eighth general council, 272 n.
Erchampert, 331, 396.
Eric I. and II., 122.
Erminfrid, 359, 364.
Ethelbald, 93.
Eudes (or Odo), 376, 384.
Eusebius, 226.
Eutropius, a priest, 162.
Excommunication freely used by John, 352.

Ferdinand I. (of Bulgaria), 215.
Ficolo, 72.
Filioque, the, 241, 269.
Fines inflicted by the Pope, 340.
Formosus, 82 n, 114, 117, 161, 209, 237, 277, 283 f., 308, 358, 369, 379, 384 n., 393, 400.
France, 332, 345.
Frangipani, the, 229 f.
Frothar, 385.
Frodoard (Flodoard), 234.
Fulk, 358, 377, 384.
Fundi, 318, 323.

Gaeta, 396.
Gallese, 353.
Garigliano, the, 318, 332, 396.
Gaudericus, 150, 290.
George of the Aventine, 283 f.

Ghost, Holy, Procession of, 67.
Glagolitic alphabet, 218 f., 246.
Gotteschalc, 101 ff.
Grado, 336.
Gratian, 284.
Greek in Latin Services, 34 n.
Greeks in South Italy, 329, 395.
Gregory the nomenclator, 283 f., 371.
Gregory I. the Great, 127, 130 ff., 145.
Gregory IV., 127, 286, 288 n.
Gregory VII., 132, 381.
Gregory of Syracuse, 55, 61.
Gregory the superista, 355.
Guaifer of Salerno, 281, 322, 330.
Guido, or Guy, of Spoleto, 281, 318, 322, 325, 355, 377 ff., 396.
Gunther, 57, 65, 70, 74, 77, 82, 160.

HADRIAN II., 66, 80 ff., 134, 143, 147, 149–231.
Hadrian III., 360–367.
Hall of the She-wolf, 347.
Hamburg, 121.
Hedenulf, 178.
Helen, 76.
Heletrude, 92.
Helmold of Bützaw, 3.
Herard, 167.
Hermas, the shepherd of, 27 f.
Hermengard, 277, 306, 382.
Hilduin, 91.
Hincmar of Laon, 167 ff.
Hincmar of Rheims, 83 ff., 124, 139 n., 169 ff., 175, 307.
Horic, 122.
Hormisdas, Pope, 199, 202.
Hungarians, the, 245.

IGNATIUS, St., 28.
Ignatius, St., Patriarch, 41, 48, 53, 203, 208, 249, 255, 259.
Illyricum, 47, 120, 239.
Imperial dignity, decline of, 301.
Indulgence, 335.
Ingelberga, 66, 82, 163, 187, 191.
Innocent III., 253.
Innocent IV., 246.
Interdict, 170.
Irenaeus, St., 29, 190 f.
Isidore Mercator, 135 ff.
Italy, South, 395

JOAN, 263.
Johannipolis, 32 ff.
John, Archbishop of Ravenna, 74, 96 f.
John the Deacon, 149, 157, 159 n., 235, 289.
John VIII., 177, 210, 231–353; ruler of Italy, 314–5, 390 n.
John IX., 245, 370, 384 n., 394.
John X., 245.
Judith, 92.

KOZEL (Kociel), 223, 238 n.

LAMBERT, duke of Spoleto, 161, 277, 297, 302 ff., 322.
Landenulf, 331.
Lando, 395.
Landulf of Capua, bishop and count, 281, 293 n., 322, 330 f.
Langres, 383.
Latin in Greek services, 34 n.
Laudes, the, 19.
Law, Canon, 2.
Le Mans, 95.
Leo, 48, 51.
Leo VI., 250, 389.
Leo IX., St., 143, 148.
Leo Grammaticus, 193 n.
Letters of Nicholas I., 125.
Letters, papal, tampered with by the Greeks, 1.
Letters, Papal: their form, 3.

Libellus de imp. potest., 3.
Liber Pontificalis, 231.
Librarian, papal, 229.
Library, papal, 225 ff.
Liturgy, Roman and Slavonic, 219.
Liturgy, Slavonic, 222, 240, 243 f., 245 f.
Locust plague, 375.
Lothaire, Emperor, 129.
Lothaire, King of Lorraine, 70 ff., 160 f., 179.
Louis the German, 121, 123, 179 ff., 240, 277, 282, 295.
Louis the Stammerer, 178, 305 ff., 311, 376.
Louis II., 9 f., 19, 66, 75 ff., 97, 114, 124, 128 f., 155, 157, 162, 179 ff., 186, 206, 274, 320.
Louis III. the Blind, of Provence, 382.
Louis III. the Young, 296, 314, 317.
Luitard, 98.

Magnaura, palace of the, 200.
Manuel, 112.
Marinus, 62, 197, 209, 272 f., 353–361, 386 f.
Martin IV., 359.
Martinus Polonus, 363.
Matilda, 94.
Mediterranean and Saracens, 319, 320.
Methodius, St., 15, 111 f., 150, 215 ff., 238 ff.
Metrophanes, 44 n., 263, 266, 268.
Michael III., 41, 46, 51, 57, 61, 66, 67, 111 f., 129, 216.
Michael VI., 381.
Moesia Inferior, 112, 119.
Moimir I, 216, 220.
Moimir II., 220, 245.
Monasteries:
Anisol or St. Calais, 95.
Monte Cassino, 332, 396.
Nonantula, 345 f., 356.
St. Sergius in Constantinople, 270.
St. Vincent on the Vulturno, 332.
Moravia, 216, 218 f., 239 ff., 241.
MS. (Addit. 8873), 233.
Muntimir, duke of Schiavonia, 243 n., 246.
Mystery Plays, 290.

Nandecisus, 99 n.
Navy pontifical, 323.
Nestor, 3, 109 n.
Nicetas, 206.
Nicholas I., 1–149, 158, 192, 252, 278.
Nicholas V., 230.
Nomenoius, 9, 165 ff.
Nona, 247 n.
Nova Tactica, 250 n.

Odorannus, 291.
Ordeals, 398.
Oviedo, 341.

Palaces, episcopal, plundered, 370.
Pandonulf of Capua, 295.
Panegyricus Berengarii, 367.
Pannonia, 238 f.
Papacy, power of, recognised by the Greeks, 48 f., 194, 207.
Passau, 220 f.
Patriarchs of Constantinople, 23 n., 25, 34 n.
Patriarchs of Constantinople: growth of their power, 35 ff.
Patrimonies of the Holy See, 78, 299, 302.
Patroni of the Regions, 13.
Paul, a Roman Priest, 113.

Paul of Ancona, 239, 252, 256.
Paul of Samosata, 31.
Pavia, diet of, in A.D. 876, 280, 285, 292 f., (889) 378.
Pelayo el Fabulero, 341 n.
Penances, canonical, 125.
Peter, cardinal priest, 266.
Peter of Grado, 336.
Peter William, 231.
Petrus Siculus, 214.
Photius, 40, 49, 57. 67, 190 ff., 217, 249, 254 ff., 273, 357, 363, 386 ff.
Pola, 99 n.
Pontion, agreement of, 293 f.
Popes and their burial places, 365 f.
Popes and councils, 70 n., 131, 143.
Popes and Emperors: their duties, 61.
Popes, patrons of kingdoms, 380.
Popes, peoples claim protection of, 248.
Popes, spiritual power of, 132 ff., 386 f.
Popes, temporal power of, 133.
Popes: their rights, 60, 70 n., 86, 88, 129 ff.
Porga, 110.
Predestination, 101 ff.
Presbiteria, 152.
Presburg, battle of, 220.
Prescription and the Roman Church, 240, 336.
Presthlava, 253.
Priestesses, 11 n.
Primacy of the Roman Church, 26 ff., 59 f., 258 f., 264 n., 270.
Procession of the Holy Ghost, 67, 390.
Provence, kingdom of, 311, 376.
Prudentius, 104.
Radelchis, 186.
Radislav (or Rastiz), 111, 216, 219, 223.
Ratram, 68.
Ravenna, power of Popes in, 299, 339.
Regino of Prum, 139 n.
Register of John VIII., 232.
Rembert, 123.
Replies of Nicholas to the Bulgarians, 114 ff.
Richildis, 298.
Robert of Le Mans, 96.
Rodoald of Porto, 46, 55, 72, 74.
Rodolf, King, 376.
Romanus, archbishop of Ravenna, 339 f., 386.
Rome, Church of, 26 f.
Rome and the East, 20 ff.
Rothad of Soissons, 83 ff.

Salzburg, 111 n., 220 f.
Sampiro, 341.
Sandals of Our Lord, 99.
Saracens, 60, 186, 257, 265, 275, 281, 285, 296 f., 318 ff.
Savonnière, 72.
Saxo Grammaticus, 3.
Schisms between Rome and Constantinople, 23 n.
Schism, Greek, 20 ff.
Schola Anglorum, 343, 359.
Scholæ, 13, 126.
Scott, John, 106.
Scupi (Uskub), 212 n.
Senate, the, 188.
Sepino, 332.
Sergius, Duke, 189, 275, 281.
Sergius, master of the soldiers, 283 f., 322, 326.
Siconulf, 186.
Sigonius, 363.
Simeon, Tsar, 112, 253.
Sisinnius, 394 n.
Slavs, 3, 107 ff.; their religion, 109 ff.

Solidus, the, 342.
Solomon, bishop, 121.
Solomon, King of Brittany, 94, 166.
Spain, 319, 340 ff.
Spoleto, duke of, 265, 281.
St Leucius, 20.
Stephania, 163.
Stephen, patriarch of Constantinople, 389.
Stephen (V.) VI., 244 f., 271, 273, 367–402.
Stephen (IX.) X., 381.
Stylian, 263, 266, 391 ff.
Suinimirus, 381.
Swatopluk, 219, 223, 238, 241 f., 244 n., 248, 379 f.
Sweden, Christianity in, 122.
Synod, permanent, 24.

TALARUS, 151, 163.
Tarentum, 395.
Telerig, 112.
Ternovo, 253 n.
Terracina, 318, 323.
Tertullian, 30 n.
Teverone, the, 326.
Theodora, 40 f.
Theodore, 8.
Theodore Santabarenus, 257.
Theodosius, 61.
Theognostus, 48 n., 54.
Thessalonica, papal vicar of, 120.
Thessaly, 60.
Theutberga, 70 ff., 83.
Theutgard, 57, 70, 74, 77, 81, 156.
Thrace, 120.
Tiara, 17 n.
Tombs of the Popes, 365 f.
Torcello, 336.
Tor di Quinto, 20.
Traetto (conference of, 330), 332.
Treasury, papal, 370.
Trilinguists, 222.

URSUS, 336.

VESTARARIUS or Vestiarius, 160 n.
Viulzachara, 364.

WALBERT, patriarch of Aquileia, 390.
Waldrada, 70, 72, 83.
Wiching, 241.
Wido of Osnabruck, 76.
William the Conqueror, 94.
Wulfad, 168.

ZACHARY of Anagni, 46, 47 n, 55, 81, 156, 263, 290, 368.
Zachary, Pope, 228.
Zengh, 246.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH

CPSIA information can be obtained at www.ICGtesting.com
Printed in the USA
LVOW011923260413
331153LV00013B/624/P



9 781143 184215